



TRUTH IS POWERFUL, AND WILL PREVAIL.

VOL. IX

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1833.

NO. 13.

UNITED STATES.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

IRISH CHARITABLE SOCIETY.

The following are the Regular and Volunteer Toasts drank at the late celebration of their Anniversary by the Society, in Boston.

REGULAR TOASTS.

1. The Day—consecrated for past ages by Irishmen in every clime, it witnesses our changeless affection to the land of our forefathers.
2. Ireland—The land for which Kings have done so little, and the King of Kings so much.
3. United States of America—she invites and protects the exiles of all nations, they are bound in duty to maintain her government, and to sustain her republican institutions.
4. St. Patrick—he made Ireland an island of saints; and Daniel O'Connell will, in a short time, make it a nation of free men.
5. The President of the United States—first among warriors and statesmen: the Irish American citizens delight to hail him as an illustrious son of worthy Irish parents.
6. The Shamrock—the patriotic emblem of the sons of Erin, may it ever flourish green in the heart of every patriotic Irishman.
7. Washington: his memory is dear to all patriots: for he made his country the home of the free, and the asylum of the oppressed.
8. The memory of General Montgomery: who fell in planting the flag of liberty at Quebec, a bright example which every Irishman ought to follow in defence of his adopted country.
9. A republican form of Government to England, Ireland, and Scotland: and equal liberty to all mankind.
10. The Boston Fire Department: a just source of pride to our city, and of admiration to our neighbors, compound of metal which is port proof, fire proof, and water proof, and shines well after a good E (A) merry polish.
11. The Sovereign people of the United States: Union be their motto, wisdom their guide, and valor their protection.
12. Education: the mighty bulwark for the defence of republican liberty.
13. The fair daughters of Ireland and America: palsied be the hand that would not protect them, and withered be the heart that would not love and esteem them.

VOLUNTEER TOASTS.

By James Boyd, President. The School-masters of Ireland—The cultivators of the mental soil of our country. May they plant it from the seashore to the mountain top, with the seeds of knowledge and liberty, and may the harvest produce a grain so pernicious to tyrants, that they will not dare to touch even a tithe of it.

Mr. R. W. Roche, Vice President, after some pertinent prefatory remarks respecting the "Union Act," gave the following sentiment.

A Repeal of the Union: Pitt and Castlereagh moored as they considered forever in the port of the British metropolis, the sail which conveyed from Ireland the charter of her rights, liberties, and privileges. But the great O'Connell, the unprecedented genius of the present age, with his phalanx of repealers, who no doubt will be all attention to her orders, will soon weigh her bow anchor and return triumphantly to the port from whence she came, with the joyful intelligence that Ireland shall no longer be a province, but shall resume her former situation, wielding the palm of pre-eminence in the scale of nations.

By James Riley, Treasurer. The vestal fire of liberty: whose light illuminates the path of the patriot to the Temple of Freedom; may its genial rays not be shed in vain o'er the green fields of Erin.

By Dennis W. O'Brian, keeper of the silver key. The independent voters of the United States, among whom none stands more conspicuous than the Irish adopted citizens: the false accusation of Mr. Everett, a member of Congress from Massachusetts, to the contrary notwithstanding.

By John Tucker Secretary. Before Mr. E. Everett will find an Irishman selling his vote (in America) for a glass of whiskey may he find a cubic foot of ice stationed in his stomach.

By Francis McKenna. The Vice president of the United States: A statesman of undoubted talents. His calumniators have got their reward, the rebuke of an indignant, and an insulted People.

By John Nugent. Agriculture, Commerce, and the Arts. Natural handmaids to each other, they must mutually co-operate, or neither can prosper.

Here the following letter and toast from C. C. Greene, Esq. was announced:

Boston, 16th March, 1833.

James Riley, Esq.—Sir—I acknowledge with feelings of gratification the invitation to dine with the "Irish Charitable Society" on Monday next, which you have politely communicated to me, and regret most sincerely my inability, on account of previous engagements, to accept it. But allow me, Sir, to express to the Society, through you, the deep interest I feel in their success, and

the pride it would have afforded me to have been with them on this occasion. I have ever felt great admiration for the Irish character, it is as distinguished for benevolence as for bravery: the meek Columbanus, "with the words of persuasion on his lips and the gospel of everlasting peace in his hands," and the valiant patriotism of Brian Boroihme in redeeming his country from her invaders, alike challenge our respect and admiration. Nor have the descendants of these distinguished men proved unworthy their ancestors; the blandishments of wealth have been unable to bribe or the cruelty of tyranny to intimidate that bold spirit of independence which has induced the natives of Ireland to make greater sacrifices for the cause of liberty, than any other people on the face of the globe.

I beg, Sir, that you will present to the Society, on my behalf, this sentiment.

Erin—Tyrants may sack her cities, and trample down the rich fruits of her fields, but they never can corrupt or intimidate the hearts of her sons.

I am, Sir, with great respect,
your obedient servant,
CHARLES C. GREENE.

After the toast from Mr. Greene was announced. Francis McKenna gave the following—

The editor of the Boston Statesman and Morning Post—his independent and fearless career in politics deserve the support of every Republican.

By Edward Kavanah. The Apostles of civil and religious freedom in Ireland—The tree of knowledge planted and watered by their hands, is of a stock too vigorous to be blasted by the tainted breeze of corruption, or be uprooted by the storm of violence.

By William Little. The Irish Charitable Society—It honours the memory of the great and good, it binds in friendship congenial hearts, it relieves distress with unostentatious benevolence, and it crowns the whole with a hospitality truly Hibernian.

By Rev. P. Byrne. The Charitable Irish Society of Boston—May its members be ever bound together by that chain that binds man to man, and earth to heaven—charity.

By Andrew Dunlap. Our republican institutions—the pride of the citizens of America, and the protection of the exiles of Erin.

By George McNeil. Americans and Irishmen—may they both fully enjoy, what they both so dearly love, and have so gallantly struggled for—free and equal institutions.

By Walter Welch. Ireland the land of Potatoes—may her sons never want a joint to relish them, or a glass of whiskey to wash them down.

By Thomas Murphy. May those who possess hearts to sympathize in the afflictions of others, never want the means to relieve them.

John McNamara proposed the health of an absent honorary Member, who always considered it an honor to dine with the Irish Society on this occasion:—

The Most Rt. Rev. Archb. Cheverus.

By Dennis Timony. The Charitable Irish Society of Boston like Joseph's Garments made of many pieces—yet intended to give warmth, and comfort to the deserving indigent tho' not seamless—may his fate be like Judas who would dare attempt to read it.

By Daniel Magner. President Jackson—invincible in the field of fame, cool, deliberate, and firm, in the Councils of his country, and a scourge to foreign and domestic enemies.

By William P. P. McKay. Daniel O'Connell—the friend of liberty whose name is familiar at the fireside of philanthropists in every nation, let him be well seconded and he shall gain for his country what Washington did for America.

By John W. Short. The ultra Temperance Societies—a revised edition of the blue laws, may public opinion soon place them in their own class with the Sunday Mail petitioners.

Among the invited guests who were unable to attend were Bishop Fenwick, the Mayor and several other gentlemen. The following letters were also received by the Secretary, in answer to invitations to dine with the Society:—

Tremont House, March 16, 1833.

Sir—The characteristic generosity and patriotism of the nation whose ensignia your Society bears, for more than thirty years, have enlisted my warmest sympathies in behalf of such of her sons as have suffered under arbitrary rule. It would give me great pleasure to comply with your public invitation for Monday next. I should there, without doubt meet those congenial spirits whose kindlier feelings are confined to no particular nation, but extend to suffering humanity of every climate. An absence however, from the bosom of my family, in the public service for several months, and the expectation of meeting them this evening, will prevent my tarry in the city beyond the time I had previously allotted myself.

I am, Sir, respectfully,
Your obedient servant.

ISAAC HILL.

Mr. James Riley, Secretary Charitable Irish Society.

Boston, March, 18, 1833.

James Riley, Esq.—Dear Sir—Allow me to express through yourself, to the "Charitable Irish Society," my respectful ac-

knowledgments for their polite invitation to join them in the festivities of this day, and my regret for being prevented from attending. Have the goodness to communicate also to the Society, as a testimony of my continued respect and regard, the following sentiment:—

The harp of Erin—Struck by O'Connell, may it soon toll the knell of oppression, and peal the anthem of liberty.

With much respect,

I am your friend and serv't.

RUSSELL JARVIS.

THE HIBERNIAN SOCIETY OF BALTIMORE.

Held their annual meeting in the Oliver Hibernian School Room on Monday, the 18th of March.

Col. S. Moore, 2d Vice President, in the absence of L. Tierman, Esq. President, and John Kelso, 1st Vice president, took the chair. A letter was received from L. Tierman, Esq. resigning the office of President, and from B. U. Campbell, Esq. resigning the office of Secretary. Whereupon it was

Resolved,—That the Secretary pro. tem. be instructed to address a letter to L. Tierman and B. U. Campbell, Esq's. expressing the deep regret with which the Society accepted the resignation of those gentlemen.

The following gentlemen were then duly elected officers of the Society for the ensuing year.

John Kelso, President.—Samuel Moore, 1st Vice President.—Wm. Gwinn 2d do.—James Reyburn, Secretary—Thomas B. Adair, Treasurer.—Samuel I. Donaldson, Wm. G. Read, Counsellors.—B. M. Bryne, G. S. Gibson, Physicians—Thos. Kelso, Sam'l Harden, H. Boyle, Chas. Tiernan, Wm. Crawford, jr. B. U. Campbell, Hugh McElderry, Managers.

The Society having resolved, at a previous meeting, to celebrate the anniversary of St. Patrick on Saturday, the 16th. of March, by a dinner at the City Hotel, a number of the members and several invited guests assembled on that day at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and sat down to a sumptuous dinner prepared by Mr. Barnum, who surpassed, on that occasion, even his accustomed taste and liberality. Col. Samuel Moore presided, supported by Thomas B. Adair and Hugh Boyle, Esq's. as Vice Presidents. Ireland's National Music resounded through the Festive Hall, and contributed largely to the evenings entertainment.

After the cloth was removed, the following regular toasts were received and drunk with enthusiasm.

REGULAR TOASTS.

1. The Day we celebrate—Its annual return brings with it "the memory of joys that are past pleasant and mournful to the soul."
2. The Emerald Isle—
"Erin, oh Erin, thy Winter is past,
And the hope that lived thro' it shall blossom at last."
3. Irishmen—Generous and hospitable at home, grateful and faithful abroad, brave and patriotic every where, their national character has bid defiance to the destructive hand of time, and the devastating influence of oppression.
4. The United States of America—The country to which industry, genius and enterprise have emigrated, and in which they have become naturalized—
"The land of the free and the home of the brave."
5. The memory of Washington.
6. The President of the United States.
7. The people of the United States—And of every State in the Union—free, powerful, and respected, as a nation because they are united.
8. The State of Maryland: The adopted home of many worthy sons and daughters of Erin, who have found amongst her citizens the acknowledged attributes of Irish character—genius, hospitality, and bravery.
9. The Army and Navy of the United States—They have contributed their full share to ensure a high rank to their country among the nations of the earth.
10. The memory of the Bards Heroes, and Statesmen of Ireland—Distinguished for their genius, their courage, their talents and their patriotism.
"Hearts that once beat high for praise,
Now feel that pulse no more."
11. The memory of Charles Carroll of Carrollton—From the eminence of a patriarchal age, he beheld the growing prosperity of a Nation for whose independence he pledged "his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor."
12. Baltimore—The city of Monuments and Fountains; of Science, and useful manufactures; of Rail Roads and Saving Institutions; the home of hospitality and enterprise; the asylum of the industrious and distressed emigrant, and the successful defender of the Star Spangled Banner.
13. The daughters of Erin and equally lovely American fair—
Dear creatures we can't live without them.
Let a cup to the smile of dear Woman go round.

After the regular toasts the President proposed the health of Luke Tiernan, Esq.

VOLUNTEER TOASTS

By William Gwynn—The Right Rev. John England, Bishop of Charleston—an Irishman and a Patriot—liberal learned and philanthropic—he is an honor to his native land, and highly distinguished in his adopted country.

By Lieut. Wade—The sons of Erin—brave generous and patri-

otic. Wherever they are found, they are the devoted and efficient friends and supporters of freedom.

By Thos. Campbell, Jr.—Eris, the land of bright eyes and valiant hearts; may the period of thy regeneration speedily arrive.

By Joseph Gegan—An enlightened public mind, more formidable to tyranny than the strongest array of military force.

By Dr. B. M. Byrne—The health of Wm. Gwynn, Esq. the patriotic Editor of the Gazette; His columns are always ready to pour their fire upon the enemies of Ireland.

By W. Crawford—Baltimore, although only third in population, stands first in public spirit and enterprise.

By James Reyburn, before proposing the health of an esteemed member now in Dublin, made some eloquent remarks upon his benevolence and patriotism, and concluded by proposing the health of Mr. Wm. Adair.

Mr. Thos. Adair made a suitable reply, in the course of which he took occasion to read a letter he had on that day received relating exclusively to Irish interests and the Hibernian Society of Baltimore. He concluded by offering the following sentiment:

Ireland—May an enlightened benevolence and a generous hospitality ever characterise her children both at home and abroad.

By Capt. Shubrick—Ireland—The land of Montgomery and of Emmet—the land of chivalry and good faith—the nursery of brave soldiers and virtuous citizens.

ENGLAND.

STATE OF IRELAND.—HOUSE OF LORDS.

Earl Grey rose amidst the most profound silence. His Lordship requested the clerk to read that part of his Majesty's speech relating to the disturbances existing in Ireland. This having been done, the Noble Earl, evidently much affected, painted in glowing colors the lawless outrages that existed in Ireland, and the painful necessity his Majesty's government was under in submitting strong measures for repressing them. We are told that the separation of Ireland is to be effected by agitation, and that the Volunteers are to be the agents for bringing about this end. It is said that no matter what remedial measures are adopted; no matter what abuses are removed; you may abolish parish cess; you may reform the church; you may remove the grievances of the grand jury system; but no matter what you do for the peace and happiness of Ireland, nothing will satisfy the volunteers, but the repeal of the legislative union. But what was the nature of that society of volunteers? It was to consist of district associations, subordinate to a committee sitting in Dublin. It was to undertake the pacification of Ireland; to put down tumults; to supercede the necessity of the police; to hold meetings simultaneously with the sessions and assizes—(hear, hear)—to determine quarrels; and to put an instrument of pacification into the hands of the Liberator. It was not to be an armed association until the law should allow it. The accredited agent of the Learned Gentleman; sent under the name of a pacificator to organize the subordinate societies; declared, at a public meeting in the county of Clare, that if it should be necessary, as it had been in the year 1793, to supply the volunteers with pikes, Daniel O'Connell would send the men of Clare into his own wood at Lough O'Connell, to cut pike handles. [Hear, hear, hear.] But it was the duty of the government to take care that there should be no pikes; and that associations so organized and for such objects should be put down. (Hear, hear.) Was it to be wondered at that, whilst such associations were in progress, while such declarations were addressed to them, there should be a general resistance to the law—that the payment of tithes should be suspended—that the collectors of tithes, and even of rent, should be assaulted, if not murdered? Although these outrages did not prevail over all Ireland, they pervaded a considerable portion of the country; and it was in the nature of such disorders to increase and extend themselves, if they were not timely and vigorously put down. (Hear.) The whole of Leinster was in this state; and in Munster, the counties of Cork and Tipperary were similarly situated; as was also the province of Ulster, to a great extent, especially in the county of Louth; and their Lordships had heard from a Noble Lord behind him what was the condition of many parts of Connaught. Their Lordships would see that the association of volunteers was connected with these outrages, from the fact that they increased as it was spread, and that they had the same objects which it avowedly sought. (Hear, hear.) It was true that the founders of that society disclaimed the use of all but peaceable and legal means; but it was evident, from the violence of the language that they employed in the work of excitement and agitation, that they availed themselves of this profession of pacification for their own protection, whilst they well knew that it would not serve to curb the ignorant people whom they inflamed, nor to protect them from the consequence of their violence. The Noble Lord then quoted from the public papers, and from the correspondence of the Irish Government, numerous instances of the persecution of witnesses and jurors in cases of prosecution connected with the outrages of the illegal associations, and contended for the necessity of immediately employing some means of putting an end to this system of intimidation. The Noble Earl stated many cases to show the gross violation of the laws, and that, from the state of society, the laws at present in force could not be executed. Witnesses dared not give their evidence, nor juries find a verdict of guilty. The present state of Ireland was, in fact, so disturbed, property and life so unprotected, that he thought their Lordships would not hesitate to adopt the measures he was about to propose. The bill which he was about to bring in had for its object in the first place to suppress all dangerous and illegal associations. To suppress, if possible, all attempts at outrage and violence. The bill would contain various provisions of acts passed at different periods by both the English and Irish parliaments, particularly that passed in the 8th of George the Fourth, commonly called the Proclamation Act, which had for its object the suppression of all illegal measures. (Hear, hear.) That act also prohibited any one being out without giving a sufficient excuse between sun-set and sun-rise. The first enactment of the present measure was to prohibit all meetings to petition Parliament, or to discuss public grievances and public acts, unless ten days' notice was previously given.—(Hear, hear.) The Insurrection act authorized all offences against its provisions to be tried at the sessions, before the magistrates, who had the power to sentence offenders to transportation. Now in the present state of Ireland, Ministers did not think fit that this power should any longer be exercised by the magistrates. The trial of all offences against this act it was proposed should, to a certain extent be subjected to martial law. The courts, however, would be so constructed, that he did not fear that the powers would contain security against unfairness; at the same time, he hoped they would be effectual in enforcing obedience to the laws. In all these Courts a Sergeant at Law or a King's Counsel should preside as Judge Advocate, and they would otherwise be anticipated. All persons found abroad between sun set and sun rise, all absent from their houses without cause, and those who had arms in their houses would be subject to the act. All persons distributing seditious papers, any attempts to injure the person or property of jurors, prosecutors, or witnesses, should also come within the provisions of the

act. The noble lord referred to another provision in the former act, protecting the officers of courts martial from future prosecutions. This was essential for their protection, and would be embraced in the present bill, though the officers would nevertheless be subject to have their conduct examined by a proper court martial. He trusted these measures would be found effectual to suppress the existing outrages in Ireland; and he should be happy when the time arrived that the proposed measures of severity might with safety be repealed. The noble lord concluded by moving for leave to bring in the bill. The bill was read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time on Monday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Feb. 19th.

Mr O'CONNELL wished for a few minutes to attract the attention of the House to the situation of his long afflicted and much oppressed country. He did so at the earliest opportunity, because he wished to express to that House of Commons the situation in which that country was like to be placed. He should, as far as he could, suppress his emotions of indignation, and no longer follow his natural impulses. He should not, whatever he might think, call the measure propounded for his country a bloody or a brutal one; but at the same time he wished to be distinctly understood not in any degree retracting the epithets which he had applied to the conduct of his Majesty's Ministers. Whilst, however, he abstained from characterising in harsh or strong language the proceedings of Government, he did not in the least compromise his opinions, or cease from holding them in abhorrence. There were injuries of that nature that were too degrading for description, and of too deep and vital consequence, to allow of personalities or admit of personal considerations. He should therefore abstain from both, and in discussing the subject which he was about to bring forward he should not only avoid personal but local considerations, and hoped that nothing except his accent should on this occasion discover him to be an Irishman. He stood up there not merely to defend Irish rights but he spoke as if he were speaking of English, Scotch, or universal liberty; in fact it was as a defender of the last that he stood up to protest against certain proceedings which he understood were then in contemplation. Let it not, however, be supposed that oppression was the less abhorrent to him because he was less violent in manner, and least of all, it should not be supposed that quietness of demeanour on the part of a people was an indicator of a less determination of purpose. Death was preferable to oppression, and the people of Ireland, though tranquil, would not be the more submissive to the yoke which was to be imposed upon them. For his own part the iron had not as yet entered into his soul; and, notwithstanding the folly and the madness of the Administration, he had still a confident hope in the integrity of the Reformed House of Commons. Before he proceeded to the consideration of a measure which had been introduced elsewhere he wished to set himself right in regard to some statements which were made respecting him. It had been asserted that he had encouraged certain Tithes Meetings, and that when he had called those assemblages together he had shrunk from attendance. He there at once declared and solicited a denial, if it could be given, if there was any truth in this statement; in point of fact there was no truth in it; there was not only no such thing, but there was no foundation for it; and any assertion more destitute of truth, or the semblance of truth, was never made. The fact was, that he was not even in Ireland at the time of the meetings referred to, and could not by possibility have undertaken to attend; and if a Committee of Inquiry were granted to him he would undertake to prove to demonstration that the meetings, of which he was said to be the originator, had been got up by the friends of Lord Anglesey. He had been at the time at the distance of 300 miles from those meetings, and he appealed to that House whether it was fair to impose upon him the responsibility of meetings in which he had no concern.—Over and over again had the acts of others been laid at his door, and, without expressing any opinion upon the propriety of those meetings, he asked whether it was fair to impute to him acts in which he had no participation? He had been frequently calumniated when he only asked to be heard in reply. He courted investigation into his conduct, and he defied the most rigid scrutiny.—Enough, however, of this subject; he had something more important to attract the attention of the House; important he said, though it bore the marks of drivelling old age, and the total absence of a manly character. It would probably be thought that some of the measures of Government were of a healing and salutary nature, and that Ministers had shown that they were well disposed towards Ireland. Let the House recollect what the Ministers had done.—They had, indeed, boasted of their Church Reform, and, as far as that went, he accepted it as a boon. What was it after all? The slight benefits it conferred were prospective. It held out no present advantages. True, it was a boon as far as the vestry cess, which, according to the statement of the Noble Lord, was £60,000 or £70,000 a year. The Noble Lord, in stating that as the amount of the vestry cess, stated also that the income of the Clergy was about £700,000. Did the Noble Lord—did any person who knew anything of Ireland—think or believe that the vestry cess amounted to one-tenth of the income of the Protestant Clergy of Ireland? Let him, however, not be misunderstood. He accepted that boon and he accepted it gratefully, trifling as it was. At the same time he wished the House to know that it was only a small relief from large and vexatious grievances. He did not retract one expression of approbation at the measure of the Noble Lord, not because he thought it of any benefit, but because it recognised in his mind a good principle. It recognised this, that the State had a right to dispose of Church property, and it incidentally admitted that the Church Establishment was disproportioned to the wants or wishes of the country. The Noble Lord had announced to the House that he meant to reduce a certain number of Bishops; but that reduction did not embrace any lessening of the amount to be paid to the Establishment. What could be more ridiculous than offering that as a boon which in no way lessened taxation? The farmer, under the measure, would not have to pay less of tithes, nor would the peasant have to pay a less contribution of his potatoes. Some few rights since the Right Hon. Secretary for Ireland had expressed himself in terms of kindness towards the Irish, and, without scrutinising the motives of the Right Hon. Secretary, he [Mr. O'Connell] received those expressions with grateful emotion. He adverted to this for the purpose of showing that he considered the present measures not as the acts of the Right Hon. Secretary, but as those of the Government, and upon that Government he was at once disposed to throw the whole responsibility. With that Government he should at once grapple, and, though he might be laughed at, he would still appeal to the House of Commons, and, until they betrayed themselves, he should never believe that they would consent to any act which would annihilate every trace of public freedom. Would they allow such a measure as now proposed to be enacted for England or for Scotland? Certainly not. Why then tolerate it for Ireland? This was, however, a matter for the consideration of the House of Commons, and in rising upon that occasion his object was more to elicit the opinions of others than to express any of his own. The Irish were often reproached with acrimony, and perhaps there was some truth in the observation. But that was foreign from the subject; and, even if

true, the question was, was there any ground for the acrimony?—However, that was another question; the real one was, whether that House was pledged to adopt coercive measures towards Ireland? True it was they voted for the Address, but they were not and therefore, pledged to any particular line of coercive measures; and he for one could never believe, until he saw it, that a Reformed House of Commons would, by supporting a Government, vote for the degradation of the Irish people. The House had gone a great way in supporting Ministers, but they would halt when the progress of Government was towards despotism. And he again would say that the Government would never be supported in any measures that would tend to Irish degradation. [Hear, hear.] The Under-Secretary for the Treasury had in some calculation which he had brought before the House attempted to show that the connection between England and Ireland was most beneficial to the latter, and he had flung back upon him the imputation of having misrepresented the views of Government. The Under-Secretary flung back with apparent indignation his charges that the Government meant to supercede the Constitution and suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, &c. Now he [Mr. O'Connell] asked the House whether he had been right in his anticipations? If he was right the Under-Secretary was then bound to come forward and support him. [Hear, hear.] Was there any intention of suspending the Habeas Corpus Act? (Hear, hear.) Was there any intention of subverting the Constitution as far as regarded Ireland? Perhaps there was not; if so, he (Mr. O'Connell) was certainly in error. But he was right; he called upon the Under-Secretary, instead of pronouncing him a calumniator, to come forward and support him. However that might be he would state this much, that the measure which he understood was in contemplation was bottomed on the most glaring and notorious falsehoods. It was but a sample of the many acts of Whig treachery which had been practised towards Ireland. It was one of those black and gloomy spots which indicated Whig ascendancy. That faction had been always hostile and faithless to Ireland. They were in power when Limerick surrendered, and the conduct of the brave men who commanded that garrison presented a striking contrast to that of the Whigs. On that occasion a Convention was signed, and immediately afterwards a French armament appeared in the bay and proffered assistance to the garrison; but the brave and gallant army who had once pledged their honor refused their assistance, and stood firm to their honor. They had signed the Treaty, and from their signatures they would not depart. Yet these were the people upon whom the Whigs attempted every atrocity. They were to be subjected to martial law, and to be deprived of every indemnity in case of false accusation. They could not even appear at prayer meetings; and in case of any charge against them they were not to be tried in their own counties, but the venue was to be changed.

Mr. C. W. WYNN rose to order. He wished to know whether it was competent for any Member in that House to refer to proceedings elsewhere, whether, in point of fact, those proceedings might or might not come under their notice.

Mr. O'CONNELL had cautiously abstained from alluding to proceedings in another place, and had merely supposed that such proceedings were in contemplation.—(The Hon. and Learned Member continued amidst considerable interruption.)—The King's Ministers are reported and believed to intend to introduce into this House certain measures—

The SPEAKER said there could be no doubt that what the Right Hon. Gentleman said was strictly in accordance with the rules of that House; but the question to be considered was, did it apply to the course of observation pursued by the Hon. and Learned Member?—It was not only contrary to the rules of that House of any Honourable Member to discuss a measure only before the other House of Parliament, but it would be extremely inconvenient. The great difficulty, however, the chair felt in all such cases was to know whether the Hon. Member was merely alluding to matters of notoriety, or to measures generally, or by him attributed to Government, or whether he was alluding to a particular measure before the other House?—He was quite sure that what had fallen from the Right Hon. Gentleman was perfectly in consonance with the rules of the House; and he was also quite sure that it would also have the effect of putting the Hon. and Learned Gentleman on his guard, and prevent the possibility of his infringing upon those wholesome regulations.

Mr. O'CONNELL said that the courtesy and distinctness of the decision of the chair must ensure his prompt and perfect compliance.—(hear, hear.) He said, then, that he spoke not of what had occurred in another place. But his course of conduct was this:—His Majesty's Government asked the House of Commons to confirm a vote of supply for 3,000l.; and he took that opportunity to call the attention of the House to the policy of the Government. Further, he attributed to that Government certain schemes to which he felt it necessary to call attention, as in voting supplies the House sanctioned the conduct of Government. One of the schemes with which he charged the Government was an intention to change the venue. He was sorry the Hon. Member with the flourishing constituency, the Hon. Member for Leeds was not in his place, or else he would have called upon him to describe this change of venue. That Hon. Member had alluded to the subject, and had said Ireland indeed would have had a grievance had the Catholics of the south been subjected to a change of venue as the Americans were. But what did the Ministers now intend? Why, to send the Catholics of the south before what the Hon. Member for Leeds calls the prejudiced Orangemen of the north for trial. Oh! he thanked the Hon. Member for Leeds for his allusion. What was one of the great grievances of Massachusetts, a grievance which drove it not only to rebellion but to revolution; for he it remembered the struggle with the parent country was not always fatal to the resistant? There were times when wrong was heaped upon wrong till at length the oppressed, out of its very weakness, became strong, and achieved a victory which sanctified acts that had otherwise been rebellion.—(hear.) But what was one of the grievances that drove the Americans to revolt? Why, they complained that the American was taken from his own country and his own tribunals to be tried in England. To take a Catholic from Ireland, and to try him in England before an English Jury, would be, judging upon analogy, such an act as the Americans was justified in resisting, and as the high-minded Reformers of England would never sanction.—This was one of the measures he accused the Government of intending to introduce, and he called upon the Reformers of England to say whether they would comply with and give their voice for the enforcement of so iniquitous a proceeding. The grievance the Americans complained of was nothing to that with which Ireland was threatened. The Americans were taken from their own country it is true, but they were tried by Juries and by the Judges of the land. See the scheme that was proposed for Ireland. It was to be in the Lord Lieutenant to declare any district in a state of disturbance; it was to be in the power of one man to outlaw all Ireland or any part of it, and the part so outlawed was to be subject to military tribunals. The law of the land was to become a dead letter at the dictum of a single man, Habeas Corpus was to be of no effect, and even the ears of Parliament were to be closed against the appeal of the oppressed. (hear.)—The Hon. Member for Oldham, whose excellent sense had enabled him to mark out a safe and wholesome course of proceeding, had

complained of the use of professional terms and phrases unintelligible to the general listener. The complaint was just. Therefore in this case, let them not hear any more about the suspension of Habeas Corpus, but rather let them hear that one man was to have the power of imprisoning whom he chose in Ireland. Such was the fact. And a man being imprisoned by whom was he to be tried? By the judges of the land and juries? No such thing.—But by five military officers who had each held a commission two years.—[some dissent.]—Yes, there was another provision, the officers must be above twenty one years of age.

Mr. SHIEL made some remarks to Mr. O'CONNELL, prompting him as to the provisions in the Bill before the House of Lords.

Mr. STANLEY rose to order. He could not permit such proceedings without protesting against them. Would the Hon. and Learned Member longer say he was not remarking upon a Bill only before the House of Lords. Not only had the Hon. and Learned Member expressly gone into some of the details of that measure, but another Hon. Member, with the very Bill, in his hand had prompted the Hon. Member [Cheers] Such conduct was evidently at variance with the rule laid down by the chair. And the House, too, would bear in mind, that the Hon. Member took this course at a moment and upon an occasion when he knew perfectly well it would be impossible for any of his Majesty's Ministers, to defend and support their measure.

Mr. O'CONNELL.—The Right Honourable Gentleman had risen to call him to order, and instead of doing so had forestalled him by a reply. (Hear.) Oh! let Ireland at least be heard; let him have fair play. If Ireland was to be gagged, let it not at least be without a hearing.

The SPEAKER said he felt himself called upon to interrupt the Hon. and Learned Member. Nothing could be clearer than that it was disorderly for any Hon. Member to go into the details of a measure not before the House, but before the other House of Parliament. He had before stated that to be the case, and he had done so the rather because when before called upon to maintain order the Hon. and Learned Member had not arrived at the point he now noticed as irregular, although there might be reason to apprehend he would do so. The Hon. and Learned Member had now gone into that detail, and if it was not meant as having reference to some measure before the other House of Parliament, but was to be taken as a mere supposition, he left to the Hon. and Learned Member to say how much it would assist his argument.—[Hear, hear.]

Mr. O'CONNELL.—He would obey the injunction of the Chair. He spoke upon supposition. [Hear, hear.] He attributed to the Government—whether right or wrong, if wrong he would be contradicted—he attributed to the Government, nay, to the Noble Lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), for to avoid even the appearance of personality he would not mention the Right Hon. Secretary [Mr. Stanley]—he attributed to the Noble Lord an intention to introduce, as a Minister to the Crown, a measure to enable five military officers to dispose of the liberty, if not the lives, of such of his Majesty's subjects in Ireland as the Lord Lieutenant chose to send before them. Nay, a majority of five officers, were to have that power. He was not surprised at the sentiments of the Right Hon. Secretary. It was but natural for the Right Hon. Gentleman to shrink from any participation in so monstrous, so horrible, a scene. Never was a plan more strongly marked with despotic boldness and tyrannical determination than this. But could it be? Was it possible that his Majesty's Government would dare to propose to a British House of Commons to give to three military officers the power of destroying the liberty of the people of Ireland? Was that a plan for English Noblemen to originate, and for an English House of Commons to sanction? But was that all? Oh, no! The Americans complained of the venue being changed from America to England, but the Americans were tried by the Judges of the land and by Juries. Such was not to be the case his countrymen. No, they were to be handed over to a military tribunal of three officers. And what was the character of that tribunal? He admired the British army. A braver never went into the field. He admired, too, the character of its officers in private life. They were humane, enlightened, kindly. But what were the military tribunals to do? How might they not be composed? If three Ensigns, or three Lieutenants formed a majority of one of them, would they venture to exercise their judgments in opposition to the wishes of Government? They dare not. If they did they would be dismissed the service. (Loud cries of hear, hear, hear.) The tribunal projected was open to every influence in the way of patronage and interest that could take from it the character of impartiality or justice; and it was to be such a tribunal that the King's subjects in Ireland, were to be delivered over bound, fettered, and gagged. Nay, more, to such a tribunal was to be given the power of punishing men for not giving evidence. Oh, let Hon. Members call to mind the scenes under a similar but not so atrocious a system. He remembered one trial which occurred in 1798. Upon it a poor wretch named Grady was called as a witness, and the trial took place in Kerry. By the by, it was a fact worthy of notice, that in 1798 there was little or no disturbance in the great Catholic counties. In Galway there was no disturbance, in Kerry but one; in Cork and in other Catholic counties all was peace. But with respect to Grady; he was called before one of these tribunals to give evidence, and his answer not being satisfactory he was ordered out, and to receive one hundred lashes. He received them, and was again brought before the tribunal. To the same question he made the same answer, and he was ordered to receive a second one hundred lashes. He did receive them, and was brought in a third time. The same question was repeated, and a third time he gave the same answer. He was ordered out to receive a third one hundred lashes; and, while the punishment was being inflicted, he fainted almost to death. He was not brought up again.—Would the House forget that such scenes as that had occurred before a military tribunal? Were they, with such horrible facts on record, to have Court Martial in Ireland? It would not be necessary before a Reformed Parliament, and in the nineteenth century, to do more than to point out such atrocities to bring on their universal execration. He charged the Noble Lord with this—intending to introduce a Bill which was to be a selection of all the bitter parts of all the severest Acts ever passed for the coercion of Ireland. He would ask the Noble Lord this—is it not a part of your plan to render the military tribunals irresponsible to the law? (Hear.) He repeated, that it was to the British Parliament in the nineteenth century he was calling attention to such monstrous matters. (Hear.) Would that Parliament desert Ireland? Ireland has stood by England in the great fight for reform, and should not England now stand by Ireland when it implored and demanded that every particle of the life and spirit of the Constitution should not be destroyed? He would not then go further into details. It must be unnecessary for him to do so. He had said enough to excite the interest of any lover of liberty who had heard him, or it was not in the power of language to do so. He demanded for his country that the constitution should not be suppressed—that the constitution should not be frittered away by unknown private witnesses. Before Ireland was merced of eve the semblance of liberty let her at least be heard—let her see her nar-

cers face to face, and in the light of day. If Ireland was to be deprived of the Constitution, and of her liberties, at least let her be heard in her defence. According to the plan of the Ministers Ireland was to be dumb; that great and important privilege the right of petitioning to be suppressed. Would England inflict upon Ireland so iniquitous a wrong? The Hon. and Learned Member, after thanking the house for the patience with which they had heard him, concluded by entreating the House, by an expression in favor of an inquiry, before the enactment of measures of severity, to entitle themselves to the eternal gratitude of the Irish people.

SIXTH WARD

The Democratic Republican Electors of the Sixth Ward, friendly to regular nominations, are requested to meet at the house of John McDermott on Monday evening, the 1st of April, at half-past seven, to hear the report of the Nominating Committee for Charter officers.

By order of the Ward Committee.

Thomas S. Brady, Secretary. GEORGE MILLS, Chairman.

FIFTEENTH WARD.

At a large and respectable meeting of the Democratic Electors of the Fifteenth Ward, friendly to the re-election of James B. Murray, as Alderman, and George W. Bruen as Assistant, convened at the house of Joseph Hunt Vauxhall Garden, on the evening of the 28th of March, Dr. Alexander Rbertson was called to the chair, and George Riley and Samuel S. Wandell were appointed Secretaries.

On motion, Resolved, That the names of the Vigilance Committee be called, when 150 gentlemen answered to their names. The meeting was then addressed by Mr. Dustin, George S. Dougherty, and J. Prescott Hall. The following resolutions were then offered by Mr. Geo. L. Bennett, which were unanimously adopted.

Resolved, That the Republican Electors of this Ward, view with indignation the attempts to intimidate individuals to create an excitement against their presence at Alderman and Assistant. And that no honest endeavor on their part shall be wanting to defeat an election supported by unfair means for vindictive and selfish purposes.

Resolved, That we cannot but admire the consistency which leads our aldermen to oppose an Alderman whom they pretend to suspect as an advocate of the rail road, and to propose a candidate who is known to have voted for its first introduction.

Resolved, That we can trace the hostility which is so unsparingly manifest to our present Charter Officers, to the same cause and the same source from which originated the attempt to prevent the election of one of our present regularly nominated representatives in Congress.

Resolved, That we have full confidence in our Alderman and Assistant and will support them to the best of our ability, against bought votes and private malice. And that we will remember the perseverance and courage which at one of the most terrible periods of our city history, defied the terrors of pestilence in the cause of humanity, as being the best possible pledge of devotion to our interest.

Resolved, That all who are in favor of the foregoing resolutions, consider themselves members of the Vigilance Committee and pledged to support the Charter Ticket headed by James B. Murray.

Resolved, That we adjourn to meet at George L. Bennett's Long Room, on Tuesday evening next at 8 o'clock.

ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, Chairman. Samuel S. Wandell, George Riley, Secretaries.

THE TRUTH TELLER.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 30, 1833.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

The manuscript report of the proceedings of the friends of Ireland, in Newark, N. J. was only handed in to this office yesterday evening, and consequently from press of matter cannot appear until next week.

The proceedings in Baltimore, M. D. Charleston, S. C. Albany, and Utica, N. Y. Lowell, Mass. and several others will be published next Saturday.

The celebration of the friendly sons of St. Patrick at the City Hotel, altho' in type is unavoidably crowded out.

The recent measure brought before Parliament by Earl Grey, shows the real intentions of the ministry towards Ireland. They have thrown aside the mask, and have avowed their design of silencing the prayers and supplications of the persecuted by force of arms. No language is adequate to express the indignation which every virtuous man must feel at this signal act of barbarity toward a suffering and unhappy people. If there be a spark of independent feeling yet remaining in the breasts of Englishmen, they will rise up in their might, proclaiming their abhorrence of this barbarous measure. They will visit with rigid justice, the authors of a project to annihilate the rights of the Irish people.

Has not blood enough been shed to satisfy the merciless Churchman, that it is now proposed to make civil war upon them? That persecuted country now remains the only example in the civilized world of the rapacity of a body of men who are dead to the feelings of humanity and mercy. With the sword in one hand and the statute book in the other, they have pillaged the hovel of the peasant, and carried despair and horror into his family. It has been too tardy a system of execution, and nothing but a war of extermination will appease the wrath of a vindictive and cruel ministry. There is still a spirit of liberty reigning over the minds of the Irish people, which will place a stigma on the authors of this barbarous invasion of the rights of human liberty, that no time can wash away. Their names will descend to posterity with the justly merited opprobrium of every friend of freedom, and if the efforts of the victims of their tyranny can avail, their infamy will be immortal. The ministry well discerned that the measures which they propose will not satisfy the advocates of reform. They know full well the necessity of making a decisive stand against the abolition of the tithes, and by that means maintaining in pristine vigor the ascendancy of the aristocracy. But the popular will will overwhelm them with confusion, for a recent triumph has not been achieved that they might become the dupes of the cruel and the treacherous. Ireland has been foremost in the struggle for reform, and how are her exertions to be rewarded? The constitutional liberty of the subject is to be

abrogated, and the personal liberty of the subject invaded by a savage and despotic soldiery. No former administration, has abetted great outrages that have been committed under the auspices of the present whig ministry. The soil of Ireland has been drenched with the blood of her own children and hecatombs of murdered victims have been offered upon the altar of tyranny, and the clergy of the established church who exult in robes are reeking with the blood of the persecuted, still remain with clenched hands to increase their catalogue of crime. Has not Earl Grey exhibited sufficient evidence that his intentions toward Ireland are every thing but peaceable? Will not the atrocities perpetrated during the term of his administration afford some proof?

Who has sent armed bands of mercenaries into Ireland to add to the calamities and increase the horrors of a suffering people? Earl Grey. Who sent a military viceroy to Ireland that the principles of war might predominate in his administration? Earl Grey. Who has invaded the personal liberty of the subject, and now proposes to fill the land with murder, and place the lives and the property of the people at the disposal of a brutal soldiery? Earl Grey. The man who has been cheered by their voice in the hour of necessity has derided their misfortunes and in the midst of their persecution has betrayed them.

We trust the House of Commons will reject the infamous proposal. The hopes and expectations of Irishmen now rest at that tribunal. But should that body assent to it, they will be rewarded by the execration of every friend of human liberty throughout the world.

ALDERMEN HALL AND MURRAY.

Active oppositions are now training against these gentlemen.—How soon, exertion and devotion to public service in seasons of calamity are forgotten! Where is public gratitude to be found?—We hope that some is still felt in the hearts of Irishmen, for those who hazarded their lives for their Fellow Citizens. ALDERMAN MURRAY visited the Hospital every day, he attended to the wants of every poor man and none aprieved who did, receive relief.—ALDERMAN HALL was in his Ward night and day administering to the sick and destitute, and we ask what poor emigrant sought aid that did not obtain it from him? But now all is forgotten. The selfish ambition of a few men, who are determined to obtain office creates this most ungenerous and we had almost said wicked proscription of these faithful public servants. We can assure those gentlemen that Irishmen have not, nor ever will forget those who stood by them in the hour of danger and calamity.

SIXTH WARD.

REGULAR NOMINATION.

The Nominating Committee, by their Chairman, reported the following ticket to be supported at the ensuing election for Charter officers:

- Shivers Parker, for Alderman.
John W. Walker, for Assistant do.
Cornelius Schenck, } for Assessors.
Clarkson Crolius, }
Samuel Weekes, for Collector.
John W. Somerindyke, } for Constables.
William Macdonald, }

The above Ticket purports to be from the Regular Nomination of Tammany Hall. Capacious indeed must be thy wings, O Tammany, which can shelter John W. Walker! Is not this the same gentleman who was once Editor of the New-York Daily Advertiser of blue light memory? Was he not in the Clay Nominating Committee at the last Election opposing Gen. Jackson?—is he not the author of the article in the Daily which speaks of a native and a foreign ticket? And you Mr. Shivers Parker, are you not a member of the General Republican Committee at Tammany Hall? Yes you are, and you are also in the embrace of a man who has written more bitter articles against the Democratic Republican party, than any Clay man in this City. And you ask the old Democrats to vote for this consistent ticket? And do you think they will? And can you ask them to do so? And to make the ticket more acceptable you have placed Clarkson Crolius for Assessor and Samuel Weekes for Collector, both keen opponents of Gen. Jackson. As pure Democrats we ask, in sober sadness is it come to this, that old Tammany must be made to cling to the skirts of Henry Clay? Vote for the Regular Nomination and you will support the interests of the Democratic Party now that John Walker, Clarkson Crolius, and Samuel Weekes are its defenders O Tempora Mutantur!

Taylor's History of Ireland.

Continued from page 76, vol. 9.

Quis nescit primam esse historiam legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat; ne qua suspicio gratia sit in scribendo, ne qua simultatis. DR ORAT.

MR. EDITOR.—For sundry and weighty reasons, not unknown to the Knickerbocker, I had been suddenly diverted from this subject, for the last week. Mr. Taylor had been left performing prodigies;—nothing less than transmigrating the ancient Irish Catholics into staunch Protestants; not only that, but into Quasi-Quartodecimans, Nestorians, Pelagians, and I know not what among the thousand and one different sects that have swarmed into existence, in every age, since the Apostles' time. But as all pious Protestants believe, that the power of Miraculicity has passed away, Mr. Taylor has no manner of right to set himself up for a miracle monger. It will not do. With all his ingenious twisting he can

not shew the remotest similarity between the discipline, much less the doctrine of the ancient Irish Church, and those of the mis-called Reformation. The very walls of the numerous mouldering Abbeys and ivy-crowned Churches, to this day existing, in many parts of Ireland, would loudly protest against the unhallowed union and proclaim their detestation. The cannibalism of our progenitors forms the next subject of pleasantry with Mr. Taylor. In this respect, the ancient Irish may be assimilated to some of those nations who, in our own time, lay claim to superior civilization. We have heard of certain English, Welch, and Scotch soldiers, who during the atrocities committed in Ireland in 1798, shewed no unequivocal tokens of this anthropophagian propensity, on the heads, noses, and fingers of the unhappy insurgents. Yet all this escaped the notice of our historian, who is lynx-eyed enough to discover, at the distance of fifteen centuries, that St. Jerome was a story-teller and a scold! After a flourish on the "Three Chapters" Mr. Taylor, with one stroke of his potent pen converts our pious and good-natured ancestors into a pugnacious tribe of Nestorians, battling against the triple crown, in defence of doctrines, disavowed even by the Reformers, and which they themselves, at this time, could have known only through a hasty Latin translation! So it has ever been with us, poor simpletons, get our heads in our fists, and then ask the cause of the quarrel.

Bandon so well known through Ireland for its love and loyalty, had the following inscription over its gates:

"Turk, Jew, or Heathen,
All may enter here but a Papist."

So it is with Mr. Taylor,

"Pelagians, Nestorians, or Shanavests,
Let the Irish be any thing, but Papists."

Al! Mr. Taylor, "you're late a while!" this trick has been played by noted black-legs and proved to fail, and in very few removes you too shall be checkmated. Pelagius, the broacher of the heresy called after his name, was a British monk of Bangor, who about the end of the second century dogmatized against original sin, and denied the necessity of divine grace to render good works meritorious. I presume Mr. Taylor would not wish to have these impious tenets, engrafted on the Church of Ireland, as by act of Parliament established. His heresy was solemnly condemned at the Council of Carthage in 418, and again in full conference at Verulam in 446; at which the Bishops of France, England, Ireland and Scotland assisted. After these decisive measures it fell into merited obscurity. "The Three Chapters," so called, as being the joint production of three Eastern Bishops, were supposed to contain a covert advocacy of Nestorianism. About the year 428, Nestorius began to broach his errors; teaching that there were two distinct persons in Christ, totally denied the Incarnation, and [consequently,] that the Blessed Virgin was mother of God. If Protestants will shake hands and fraternize with all the heresiarchs introduced to their acquaintance by Mr. Taylor, they will have no reason to feel proud of the alliance. In the general Council of Chalcedon 451, which condemned the Eutychian heresy, the authors of the "Three Chapters," along with the assembled Prelates, unhesitatingly concurred in the anathema pronounced against Nestorius and his abettors. Yet in the face of this fact, so well known to every reader of ecclesiastical history, Mr. Taylor has the singular modesty to assert, that the Council tacitly approved of the heresy: "for which," adds he, it was severely censured by the supreme Pontiff. But our readers shall see that,

"No falsehood can endure
Touch of celestial temper, but returns
Of force to its own likeness."

As the Council did not approve of the heresy; nor did the Holy See pass any censure: for the best of all reasons,—that there was nothing censurable in the entire proceeding. Nay, more, Pope Vigilius in condemning the "Three Chapters" does so under the saving clause, "without prejudice to the Council of Chalcedon:"—a clause rendered necessary to counteract the intrigues of the Eutychians, who, like their more modern imitators, in revenge for their own condemnation, were endeavoring, through the mischievous interference of the meddling Justinian, to inculpate the fathers assembled at the Council, in the imputation of Nestorianism; and this, on the untenable ground, that, because the Council did not condemn the "Three Chapters," by name;—it must have a leaning to the advocated heresy;—although, as has been shewn, the authors of the obnoxious chapters publicly joined in the anathema pronounced against Nestorius and his adherents. This, the Council, taking as the most satisfactory recantation of the erroneous doctrines, taught in the "Three Chapters" forbore, through delicacy to the repentant authors to condemn the books in a more public manner. All this is so plainly stated in ecclesiastical history, that the wonder is, it can be mistaken. But like the poor Irishman who endeavored to console himself for a dearly bought fowling piece with a warped barrel, by swearing he bought it for shooting round a corner; so with Mr. Taylor's powers of vision: which appear to labor under that species of idiocracy, known by the classic appellation of—*squint*:—particularly when reading or composing any thing relative to Catholics or Catholic doctrine.

One by his views,
Mought deem him born with ill disposed eyes,
When oblique Saturn sat in the house of th' agonies.

The next of Mr. Taylor's little mistakes is, when he affirms, that St. Augustine employed a body of Saxon Pagans to murder 1200 monks at Bangor. So unrelenting, insinuates, Mr. Taylor, was the hatred existing between the ecclesiastics of the British and Irish Churches and the missionaries sent from Rome, to convert the

Saxons. He should have added, as most interesting circumstances, that it was pure retrospective revenge, which prompted the blood-thirsty Italian to this deed of slaughter, because Bangor had, nearly two centuries before, given birth to the Pelagian monster; and because the crafty missionary wished to prevent the possibility of its producing any more of the brood, by cutting them up, root, and branch. Oh the barbarian!

All their pretty little ones,
Did Mr. Taylor say all? O, hell-kite!—All?
What all their pretty chickens and their dams
All one fell swoop?

Oh the curse of Cromwell on him! to Burke so many poor monks, with their dear wives and little ones, five years—after his death!!! For, gentle reader, you must know, that this murdering Prelate died in 608, and the massacre of the monks, by Elhelfrid, the pagan king of Northumbria—[with whom St. Augustine never had any communication—in this life at least—] was not perpetrated until 613!!! See *Ussher*. What a nasty old curmudgeon of a bishop that Austin must have been, who could not rest in his grave, but go roaming about the fields, with his raw-head and bloody-bones, staring all the old women in the country out of their wits, with his saucer eyes; and poking the monks of Bangor out of their cells, with his rotten crozier. Why Johnny Fox of mendacious memory was fairly outdone by the witty Italian; for Johnny only spitted and roasted his verisimilous martyrs some two or three years before their natural death; but here's Mr. Taylor for you, that like the Witch of Endor with the ghost of Samuel, conjures the Italian Archbishop from his silent tomb, five years, after his death to cut the throats of the monks of Bangor, wives and all!!! What degree of credit can be attached to the writings of a man so utterly reckless of truth? If truth had been Mr. Taylor's "only object" would he have made so many notorious blunders? Would he not in "every instance consult the original records, and make no assertion which they did not fully support?" Can he plead ignorance, that this last anachronism is in express contradiction to the Venerable Bede, who relates that the massacre of Bangor happened a considerable time after the death of St. Augustine:—*Quamvis ipso jam, multo ante tempore ad caelestia regna sublato?* And yet this work has been recommended as "an authentic and well written History of Ireland!" Whenever Mr. Taylor's anti-catholic propensities appear for a while dormant, he never fails to introduce as a suitable succedaneum, a reprehensible bias to exalt the courage and conduct of the English, on every occasion; from the commencement of the Strongbowian invasion down to the termination of his work. As one out of many, he attributes the capture of Wexford—to the terror of the citizens and garrison—on beholding the formidable array of the Normans: and he moreover says, it withstood no more than one assault, until it surrendered: whereas it is a notorious fact in Irish history, that without the assistance of the renegade Irish and the Leinster cavaliers under Dermot, the band of Norman adventurers "although cased in steel" would have been speedily driven into the sea; and that notwithstanding the powerful co-operation of their Irish allies, the besiegers were thrice repulsed, in three desperate assaults made on three successive days; and obtained possession by honorable capitulation; only through the interference of the Clergy, to spare the effusion of bloodshed. It was the humane but ill advised interference of the illustrious St. Laurence O'Toole, emanating as it did, from the best and purest motives, that furnished Mr. Taylor with a pretext of slandering this great and good man, whom he calls "a double traitor." But he, forgets to tell us that this Prelate narrowly escaped assassination in England, whither he was summoned by the persecuting Henry; and by whom he was detained a prisoner the remainder of his life. In relating the achievements of Mac Murchad O'Conanagh, during the reigns of Richard the 2nd, and his successor, Mr. Taylor takes care, that the glory acquired by the brave Lagenian Chieftain should be as much diminished as possible; while the defeats, disgrace and treachery of the English, who endeavored to assassinate the enemy, they could not conquer, are most studiously kept out of view. This gallant warrior and true patriot, who for several years, had successfully resisted the whole power of England, and who had effectually humbled the arrogance of the invaders, by compelling them to pay him tribute, was at length taken off by English poison;—and yet of this, Mr. Taylor says not a word! although he treats us to a beautiful little romance about a tiny page, who after the fatal battle of Athenree, slew two Irish chieftains together! Tom Thumb and the Ogres! But Mr. Taylor takes care to let the world know his Cromwellian descent, and the pride he feels thereon. Well you may wear it Mr. Taylor: in truth, it becomes you finely. Had you told your readers, you were of Milesian descent, a strong doubt might arise, as in the case of Lord Castlereagh, whether Ireland ever gave birth to so degenerate a child. See *Byron's Avatar*.

In alluding to some "pretended prophecies often used by lovers of sedition in Ireland," Mr. Taylor evinces much inattention—to say no worse—to the common events of the day. "In 1825," says he, "was printed a ridiculous commentary on the Revelations, named Pastorini's Prophecies, containing a calculation, that 1835—[quære 1825?—] would be the era of the restoration of the Catholic religion." Short as this sentence is, it contains no fewer than 4 errors! First, the work had been frequently printed before. Its first appearance was in 1776, and by 1825, it had reached the 10th or 12th edition.—2dly, it is not a ridiculous commentary. The learned Abbe Teller says, "it is the only good commentary, which England has produced on the Apocalypse." "It is," adds he, "a learned and edifying performance:—3dly, it was not named "Pastorini's Prophecies," but "Pastorini's Commentaries." Pastorini being the assumed signature under which the pious and erudite commentator, Dr. Walsley chose to appear: 4thly, it does not pro-

mise the restoration of the Catholic religion in 1825 or any 5: it merely gave it, as a probable conjecture, that the power to persecute God's holy Church, would cease, and also, that those nations which had persecuted it, would suffer some calamity from the pouring out of the vial, about that time! So much for Mr. Taylor's accuracy!

But it unluckily happens, that Mr. Taylor often stumbles on topics, of which he knows little and cares less, provided he can only have a fling at Pope or Popery; in some shape: whether of a big, bouncing biblical lie; or that of a sly, sneaking, insinuating slander—

"Whether a spirit of the deep or goblin damn'd!!

The conclusion, with Mr. Sampson's *Addenda* shall form the subject of my next communication.

SARFIELD.

FOR THE TRUTH TELLER.

MR. EDITOR:—The criticism of "Sarsfield" on "Taylor's" history, is well worth the serious attention of every body who is a lover of truth. Taylor, in my humble opinion, has all the liberality of a French or Scottish philosopher on his lips, and the cant of the bigotted biblical in his heart and in his anti-catholic Irish history.—To the tail of that miserable production, is appended a Calvinistic *fac simile*. How unworthy the author of the "Memoirs," is it not? Mr. Editor if you understood the language of Ireland, you would be too sensible of it. It is a pity to see gentlemen glorying in their aberrations. Take the word *Culdee* for instance. Who would glory in being a *Culdee*? And why? Because its true meaning creates horror in the mind of every good man. *Culdee* signifies one turned away from God, in short a pelagian heretic. *Cul* is back, and *Dee*; of God; that is the real meaning of the word. In Irish, we say *cul mo laiv leat idest—the back of my hand to you*, otherwise my total rejection of you. Every one acquainted with the Irish language will admit all this. But to make a *Culdee* a worshipper of God is to reject the old Irish tongue. Who can derive *Culdee* from the Latin *Cultores Dei*. What is the Irish word for the worship due to God? It is *adhraadh De*. None can find a word but *adhraadh* for adoration or worship, in the Irish tongue. But the word *Culdee* shews the backslider from God and his divine truth, in short the Pelagian: It is the Pelagian *Culdee*, St. Jerome speaks, when he says, that the Pelagian was bloated with Scotch gruel.

O. C.....

TO THE IRISH RESIDENTS IN NEW YORK.

THE DISTRESSED PATRIOT.

He that hinders a charitable person from giving alms to a poor man, is tied to restitution.

TAYLOR'S HOLY LIVING.

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN—There are few, I believe, among the intelligent portion of this community, who have not read the works of Mr. Banim, the celebrated Irish Novelist. Fewer still among Irishmen, at least, who have not been delighted with the natural and highly graphic delineations of Irish character and Irish locality interspersed throughout his pages. This, however, is the least of Mr. Banim's merit. It is as a highly gifted and amiable writer, as a true-hearted Irishman and sterling patriot, we recognize the author of the "O'Hara Family." The paramount object of his numerous productions has been to vindicate the national character; to raise Ireland and Irishmen to their proper station in the great European family; to denounce oppression; to proclaim the untold miseries of his degraded countrymen; and to awaken the sympathy of England, of Europe, of the civilized world in behalf of his native land. So various, so powerful, and so thoroughly philanthropic have been the labors of this indefatigable writer, that, in a literary point of view, it may be said, with the solitary exception of Tom Moore, there is no other man now existing, to whom Ireland owes so much as to Mr. Banim. The man who has won this distinguished honor, the man who has labored long and usefully in the cause of Ireland and suffering humanity; the man who has done that for Ireland,—which the immortal Scott has done for "the land of the heather"—who has given the history and literature of his country, "a local habitation and a name;"—he who has done all this, is now stretched on the bed of sickness, and in daily apprehension of ending his days in prison!!! During the ravages of the Cholera through the British islands, he was attacked, imperfectly recovered, suffered a relapse, and was finally obliged, by the peremptory orders of his Physician, to abandon the labor of the pen:—his only means of support. Owing to this awful visitation, accompanied with other and bitter disappointments, poor Banim is now deeply involved in debt, in momentary danger of a jail, with a shattered constitution, living in a most destitute condition at *Boulogne* in France: whether he was advised by his medical friends, to remove for the benefit of climate and change of scene.

Fellow-Countrymen, subscriptions, monuments and honors have been decreed to *Dryden*, to *Scott*, to *Sheridan*, to *Burns*—and deservedly—but it was AFTER their death, when alas! the lauded object was no longer sensible to all this late and lavish posthumous adulation. Now before it is too late, a little timely aid, contributed by each individual, according to his means, might prove the salvation of our afflicted countryman; by liquidating his debts, repairing his infirm health and restoring him again

to his desolate wife and children. Liberal subscriptions have already been entered into in England and Ireland for his relief. Will Irishmen in America be slow in contributing their mite to rescue an estimable citizen, an undoubted patriot, and a warm-hearted countryman from an early and a premature grave?

SARSFIELD.

N. B. To avoid procrastination on so urgent a case, the benevolent of all nations might assemble at some convenient place in the different wards, to raise subscriptions; which might then be forwarded by accredited persons to London to Messrs. Hoare, Fleet-street, Messrs. Hopkins, Regent-st, Waterloo Place, Bankers.

TO DR. BROWNLEE,

A Preacher in the Middle Dutch Church.

No. 4.

I will not utterly consume thee; but I will chastise thee in judgment, that thou mayest not seem to thyself innocent. Jer. 30. 11.

REV. SIR—In the days of Pagan Philosophy it was observed, that an honest man struggling with adversity, was a spectacle worthy of the Gods. Whether any distinction of case in the object of their contemplation has been remarked by the ancient Scholiasts is unknown to us;—that is, whether the God be equally affected by the patience of him, who, though innocent, contends with the bitterness of his affliction, and of him who has been the cause of his own woe. Not having studied the phases of mental affection to which the Pagan Deities were subject, it would be presumption in us to estimate the degree of compassionate admiration they would extend to you; but it is suspected it would not widely differ from that now cherished for you by your controversial opponents,—even by the Members of the Middle Dutch Church, your sacerdotal brethren, or to express it briefly, by the enlightened among your "christian public." But, whatever may be the gradations of pity in the minds of Pagan Celestials, there is a fixed standard of measure among the mortals of earth. He who is the mechanist of his own merited misfortune is conceived to have but a slight claim on pity. He who rushes headlong into difficulty, without calculating results and consequences; he who like a player struts forth on the public stage stiffening his hamstring and proclaiming a CHALLENGE in "King Cambyzes' vein," yet fails in the execution of great promise, is deservedly a mark for the finger of derision. He who idly and presumptuously forms a false estimate of his mental strength, though familiar with the "Hebrew and Greek of the Holy Ghost," and summons notoriety to his prowess in polemic fight, yet cannot establish his Rule of Faith by argument and logical proof, sinks unpitied and unwept to that state where mock and gibe are his comforters. This is the retributive justice of human judgment,—and, had the old Scholiasts philosophically pondered on the question, a similar one might have been discovered among the crowned heads of the Pagan Heaven. Were it your destiny to have been present at a levee day on the summit of Olympus, and had you edified the assembly by the ribald phrases and gross allusions which, in your last logical epistle, abound in such unpruned luxuriance, the punishment of the old blacksmith of Lemnos would have been your meed, and Minerva's bird would have derided your fate.

Passing, however, from the lighter tone of these remarks, we would seriously interrogate you, Rev. Sir, is your last letter, no matter how interpreted by the mind most biased in your favor and to your creed, no matter how enwrapped in contemplation of your exalted worth and character, is your last letter worthy of a scholar, worthy of him who is intimate with the interior spirit, and familiar with the "Hebrew and Greek of the Holy Ghost?" Is it, in any sense, a logical and theological production? Does it, even remotely, bear on the matter in question—your Rule of Faith? Does it evolve any of the important queries so often required of you? Every impartial mind will say it is as distant from the point at issue as the filth of the Collect is from the farthest orblight in Heaven's firmament! Between it and the reply you should have given, the difference is as wide as between the architecture of the Middle Dutch Church and the sublime Temple of the Catholic Vatican!

You are again interrogated. Does your last letter honor the station you occupy? Does it honor the Gospel you preach to your flock; that Gospel which commands the love—even of enemies? Does it honor him who wastes the midnight oil over the Holy Scriptures, and who "evolves the meaning by all proper means, should there be any thing not so plain as at first view you wish?" Does it honor him who erects his Rule of Faith on the whisperings of the interior Spirit, and, through its illumination, selects from the "Hebrew and Greek of the Holy Ghost," those necessary articles of creed on which his salvation depends? To reconcile the affections of soul evinced in your last letter with the gentleness, urbanity, and religious decorum, generally supposed characteristic of the sacerdotal garb, is a task

not easily effected. It is as difficult as to blend in one system of rational dependency the endless and irrelevant topics on which you have endeavoured to found your Rule of Faith?

A theme to which you fondly recur is the "glorious liberty of conscience" secured by what you term, the "ever blessed Reformation!" You love to descant on it, and by it enlist in your favour republican feeling.—Is it a part of this glorious liberty to exhibit the "spleen of the under fiends" in your polemic "squintings," when you shun the real point in question, and wantonly riot in disgusting ribaldry? Attend to the monition of St. Paul,—“if you bite, take heed that you be not consumed.” You vaunt your intimacy with the interior Spirit! Where are its fruits? Are your vituperative words, your foul allusions, your envenomed drivel against Catholic rites, practices and ceremonies, its fruits? In your last letter you designate the Clergy of the Catholic Church a "polluted and immoral priesthood!" Is this a fruit of your interior Spirit? Is this proving your Rule of Faith and the inspiration of the Bible? You call the Catholic Church the "scarlet woman of St. John!" Is this a fruit? Is this your "Protestant lesson and logic?" You say the celibacy of Catholic Priests is "a pleasant joke,"—an "imposition on the rights of man to secure all the monies for Peter's purse!" Is this a fruit? Is this Protestant argument? You say the Catholic Church "brings every thing into market, for money, even souls and bodies of men, and each sin, which has its own price in the Pope's exchequer book!" Is this a fruit? Is this fiendish slander one of your proofs to establish the canonicity of the Scriptures, and that the Bible contains the whole of the word of God? Among the fruits of the Holy Spirit, St. Paul enumerates "charity, peace, benignity, mildness, modesty." Are the fruits of Dr. Brownlee's spirit like to these? But, then, you exultingly "claim to be a gentleman," and that you "write for the members of the Middle Dutch Church!" What, is it thus you insult your flock! Thus you slander them! Thus you explain the "Hebrew and Greek of the Holy Ghost" to them! What, you "write for the members of the Middle Dutch Church," and proclaim the clergy of the Catholic Church a "polluted and immoral priesthood!"—Surely, though you be their writer and their preacher, they cannot sanction the filth of your tongue, the grossness of your mind, and the malignity of your heart! If they do,—if your words convey the real estimate of their character, we, in truth, admit, but in sorrow, the force of your observation, that the members of the Middle Dutch Church "are a very different people from the flock of St. Patrick's Pastor." If, when it is avowed, "you write for the members of the Middle Dutch Church," you mean that they approve and applaud the virulent pollutions and falsehoods oozing out from your writings, then we say, and every honorable, manly, and christian heart will sanction our remark, the flock is worthy of the Pastor, and the Pastor of the flock. But it is not possible,—it cannot be believed. The virtuous, the enlightened, the manly among the members of the Middle Dutch Church—and there are many rich in these endowments among your congregation—cannot honor with approval your impure and defiling slander, that the Catholic clergy are a "polluted and immoral priesthood!" Though you proclaim yourself their writer and their preacher, they cannot venerate him, whose heart and mind, rankling in the bitterness of discomfiture, and writhing under the tortures of defeat, seek ease for their griefs and sorrows in the basest indulgences of spleen! Unable to meet your antagonists in manly and logical argument,—disgraced in the judgment of all who can form an opinion of your artifices, tricks, and cavils,—fallen from your high estate as the proclaimer of a presumptuous CHALLENGE,—skulking under the shelter of subterfuge and rank slanders, into which you breathe a still ranker life,—a prey to the gnawings which eat into your very heart's core under defeat, disgrace, and dishonor, you sputter out the morbid secretions of an envenomed will, then "claim to be a gentleman," and honor the virtuous and religious members of the Middle Dutch Church with the sponsorship of your ribaldry and rancour!!! This, for a gentleman, theologian, and preacher, is a strange form of procedure,—unusual in the annals of religious controversy. The main topic under discussion is avoided, studiously shunned, and you name it by your own classical term—"squinting." You shrink from the necessary queries so frequently put to you, though you avowed their "infinite importance," and promised to "discuss them first," and this you call "skirmishing." You designate the celibacy of the Priests a "pleasant joke," "an imposition on the rights of man to secure all the monies for Peter's purse," and yet you "claim to be a gentleman." You say the Catholic Church "brings every thing into market, for money, even souls and bodies of men, and each sin has its own price in the Pope's exchequer book," and you shout "BILLINGSGATE." You deliriously charge the Catholic clergy with being a "polluted and immoral priesthood," piteously whine out "BLACKGUARDISM," and invoke the

commiseration of the members of the Middle Dutch Church against the lash of your antagonists, by saying you are "THEIR WRITER." In truth, it may be said, "the tribulations of the just are many;" and with afflicted Job, you may exclaim, "the arrows of the Lord are in me, the rage whereof drinketh up my spirit." Job. 6. 4. But your cry for succour from your flock will be despised;—your evasions, subterfuges, and rancorous slanders, are profitless,—they will be contemned.

"Thou may'st toil and strain,
Ransack, for filth, thy heart; for lies, thy brain;
Rave, storm!—'tis fruitless all."

Consigning you, Rev. and gentlemanly Sir, to the sedative influence of the preceding remarks, and your "claims of being a gentleman" to the members of the Middle Dutch Church and the "christian public;"—committing you to the fostering love of your "most virtuous, pious and highly intelligent ladies," who you say sat in judgment on the luscious slander and tale, "Lorette, or the history of a Canadian Nun," and whose verdict is, "that it must be printed and given to the public as an INSTRUMENT of instruction for their sex!"—(see an article signed Dr. Brownlee in last Saturday's "Christian Intelligencer,"—the Instrument of the Middle Dutch Church,)]—we proceed to your last epistle.

We have read this exotic, rather this Quix-otic, production of your interior Spirit; and, while reading it, our spirit yearned after the "form of sound words!" Where are they, logical and gentlemanly Doctor? Reason and argument! Where are they? Answers to our queries! Where are they? Proofs of your claims to gentlemanship! Where are they? Pardon; there is one,—a deep damning one! You write for the Members of the Middle Dutch Church, and drench with your slaver the Catholic Clergy by denouncing them a "polluted and immoral Priesthood." We await their approval of your claims;—we await the verdict of "your virtuous, pious, and highly intelligent ladies" who correct the proof-sheets of your new bantling—the "INSTRUMENT."

Again our queries are repeated. To your "christian public" and your flock they must now be as familiar as "household words."

How do you know the Bible to be the word of God? How do you know which books were written by divine inspiration?

Does the Bible contain the whole of the word of God, or does it not?

Have these queries been answered? Though you have been tortured by the iteration of them, and though, under the evident excitement of the interior spirit, you a second time affirm in your last epistle, that "we have no right to pronounce sentence on one of your arguments," we greet you in the gentlest and most gentlemanly words, and suggest, that if these queries have been answered and proved, the answers and proofs are as invisible as if surrounded by the darkness of an Egyptian fog. Condescend to point out the letter and column of the Truth Teller in which they may be found. This, if done, will save you much irritability of temper, and confer on you the title of a logician in a slight degree, though it will not force from the "christian public" an admission of your "claims to be a gentleman." But you assert you have proved your rule of faith. Where? In your last letter? Here we must express our dissent by that very uncourteous monosyllable—No. Not even the shadow of argument on this point. Nothing in your last but an assumption of "claims to be a gentleman,"—that you "write for the members of the Middle Dutch Church,"—nothing but an idle drivel about the "liberty of conscience,"—American Republicans,—a startling phrase, anthropological, to prove intimacy with the Hebrew and Greek of the Holy Ghost,—“Hebrews and Jews,”—“the Church at Jerusalem, Antioch,” &c,—Inishowen,—“the cook and the copper kettle,”—“a polluted and immoral priesthood,”—“the Pope's exchequer book,”—the celibacy of the priests,—“a pleasant joke,”—“Mr. Hughes and Bishop Milner,”—a bead roll of Popes, and “other branches of learning!!!”

Thus you go up, up, up;
And thus you go down, down, down;
Thus you go backward and forward,—
And, heigh for your logic, dear BROWNLEE!

The proofs of your rule of faith are not in your last letter,—they were not given in your former letters. Do you forget our exposition of your evasions and subterfuges in our last letter? If false, why has it not been controverted? Do you forget your see-saw logic in the vicious circle? You assert that we "raised the outcry to yield the point." Where? We required you to prove your rule of faith? It has not been proved, for the proofs advanced, that is, a few texts of Scripture, were shewn to be illogical in their bearing. Our exposition of your texts is, essentially, admitted, since it has not been disproved. Hence your rule has not been yet established by argument. Is this true. Answer if you can, and shew where we have erred. We do not, we did not solicit you to yield the point; proofs are demanded, and if they be not given, the important point under

debate is surrendered without your admission. It is worthless,—a pretension to cheat the ignorant, and gull your "christian public." In your last epistle it is affirmed you have "established the inspiration of the Bible by its own internal evidence, and by external proofs, such as miracles, tongues, prophecies; and by historical evidence, and tradition also." In the name of Truth, for truth should be on the lips of a preacher in the Middle Dutch Church, where and when has this extraordinary feat been performed? Where are your arguments? Assertion may dupe your "virtuous ladies" to whom you submitted the verdict of your "Instrument for instructing the sex;" assertion, however, is not argument with your polemic antagonists. But, though there be no proof of your rule of faith in the preceding words, there are admissions which will develop matter of vital importance, at a more advanced stage of this controversy. At present, it sufficiently serves our purpose to observe, that, your dependency on the "Churches, Jews," &c. for the inspiration of the Scriptures, is an abandonment of your cause, for it is a sunlight proof, the Scriptures ALONE are not your rule of faith. Mark this, weigh it, place it in the scales of your see-saw logic. You will wriggle, and fret, and rave, and prove yourself "a gentleman," ere this be rescued from our clutch. We may here, also, note your rash assertion, "that our rule never can be found out on our principles, or employed for the benefit of man." What is our principle? Simply this,—the Church of Christ ruling herself by the Holy Scriptures and the traditions of the Apostles. Will you presume to assert the Church of Christ cannot be found? But, since the Church of Christ can be found, and this is admitted by every christian, it follows that her teaching can be known. If it could not be found, then, in vain, did Christ establish it.

Your register of and tirade about the Popes is out of place, of no consequence to the real matter under consideration—your rule of faith. Where have we said the Popes were the Church of Christ? Answer.

Independent of the absence of all rational proof in your letters, there are serious omissions of several important topics in your last epistle. You "solemnly denied" that Luther rejected any part of the sacred writings. He did reject a part of them. Why shrink from the important argument involved in this rejection? Is it worthy of a Preacher in the Middle Dutch Church? Did we misquote "honest John Wesley," when we advanced his words as a practical illustration of your Rule of Faith? Did he not adopt your private spirit while interpreting the Scriptures, and admit, "he might possibly have mistaken the way to Heaven." Have you consulted Dr. Bangs? Did we misquote the Protestant Doctor Field, Hooker, Hare, Middleton, Warburton, Dudith, Calvin. Reckless of truth, and utterly indifferent to the sacred character of your station as a Preacher, you asserted that "not one sentence of inspired Scripture was lost." Did we misquote St. Paul?—His words to the Colossians and Corinthians have convicted you of falsehood. Will St. Paul admit "your claims to be a gentleman." When your inconsistencies, contradictions, and violations of sacred truth are detected and exhibited to the eye of public scorn, why blame us, why pelt us with your gentle term—"blackguardism;"—why allow your interior Spirit to manifest its infirmity—the irritability of bitter temper. The cause of your edifying excitement cannot be attributed to us. We are guiltless,—merely discharging a necessary duty, a duty imposed on us by your CHALLENGE; merely training you in the ways of argument and love of truth, not "Protestant rule and lesson;" merely directing your steps in the paths of discretion and charity to your neighbour. Love truth, cultivate sincerity, study logic, and many of the errors into which you have already fallen will be avoided. Cherish intimacy with patience as you do with your interior spirit. The "Hebrew and Greek of the Holy Ghost" says;—"He that is patient, is governed with much wisdom; but he that is impatient exalteth his folly." Do not a second time assert that "not one sentence of inspired Scripture has been lost." Do not again, we entreat you, contradict St. Paul. Fly from misrepresentation and falsehood as you would from the adder fanged. "Lying lips," says the Bible, "hide hatred." Be gentle in your words, modest in your allusions, and do not permit your interior Spirit to indulge again in the gross aspersion, that the Clergy of the Catholic Church are a "polluted and immoral priesthood." By a little practice in this courteous habit, your "claims to gentleness" may be admitted, and a good name may be acquired:—and you know the Scripture says, "a good name maketh the bones fat." Hoping you may profit by these salutary words of counsel, we submit to your tutored intellect a few more words of logical comment on your Rule of Faith and discursive letter. For your sake and the sake of our readers, it is to be regretted the "form of sound words" has been neglected,—the order of rational procedure contemned. Still the usual see-saw oscillation from topic to topic, and every topic more distant from the real mat-

ter under discussion. How truly may Ovid's words be applied to you,—

"Nunc huc, nunc illuc, et utroque sine ordine curro."

You have told us, in your letter No. 2, the Protestant Church declares, that the only rule of faith and judge of controversy is the "Holy Spirit speaking to us in the written word of the Old Testament and of the New; and teaching us every thing necessary to be known and believed, in order to our glorifying God and enjoying him for ever." These, Rev. Sir, are your own words. Now, we deny that Christ ever established this Protestant rule, as the only rule of faith, "to teach every thing necessary to be known and believed, in order to our glorifying God and enjoying him for ever." You have seen our reasons for this denial, and you have not even as much as approached one of them. You have written of quidlibets and quodlibets, of any thing and every thing, it is true, but not one word to the point,—not one word of wisdom. We call on you, in the face of the Biblical world, to produce one single text of Scripture, which tells you "that the only rule of faith and judge of controversy, established by Christ, is the Holy Spirit speaking to us in the written word of the Old Testament and of the New." You, who profess to believe nothing, for which there is not Scripture, are strictly bound to favour us with an unequivocal and express Scriptural proof, on this all important point. We expect this from your candour, so do the members of the Middle Dutch Church,—so do the "christian public." ONE appropriate text from the Bible, will serve you more in this cause, than all you can gather from "The History of the Roman Treasuries" by Foulis, a work justly styled the Grand Arsenal of Anti-catholic Ribaldry, and from which your malignant "PROTESTANT" has so copiously drawn. Your language, Rev. Sir, does not become your years or your orthodoxy. The famous Tertullian leaves scurrility to heretics and the gentiles. "Spurciloquium decet hereticos ac Ethnicos." Lib. de resur. car:

In addition to the many arguments we have already adduced to prove, that the Bible alone, is not the rule of faith which Christ established, we beg leave to call your attention to the following suggestions.

First, when Christ sent his apostles to convert the world, he did not say go and distribute the Scriptures to the nations of the earth but "Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature."—Mark xvi. 15. Why were not the apostles commanded to give the people your rule of faith, if it were the rule which Christ established. Answer this, Rev. Sir, answer it as becomes a theologian and a logician and not by Calvinistic rambling, evasions and petulance. The Catholic alone, Rev. Sir, can give a satisfactory answer to him who asks, why Christ did not command his apostles to distribute the Scriptures to the nations of the earth? He will say, that, the Scriptures, as interpreted by every man's spirit, were never intended by Christ as a means of conveying religious instruction. For, religion was given to the uneducated as well as to the learned. Now, the greater number of mankind cannot read, and no divine command exists as to their being obliged to study letters. Tell us, then, for our information, what is the rule of faith of the unlettered Protestant? Is it that book which he cannot read? To assert this would, to use your own words, "argue a derangement in the moral faculty." How then is the unlettered Protestant to be instructed in his religion? Doctor Brownlee and the Parsons will interpret the Bible for him, as they are taught by the Holy Spirit, and the poor unlettered man is seduced into the belief that he is taught by Christ himself and not by proxy, like the blind papist!!!

Secondly. The Bible is a book more or less obscure in most parts of it, and full of things "hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction." 2 Pet. 3. 16. Some texts seem to contradict others: Several appear to inculcate the very vices which God condemns: Hence, the worst of crimes may be perpetrated and defended, as they frequently have been, on the supposed authority of Scripture, when Scripture is left to private interpretation. Doctor Hey, a Protestant, in his Norrisian lectures says that all the horrors and follies of the grand rebellion in England, even the murder of the King, were supposed by the people to be authorised, by certain texts of Scripture; and concludes by saying, that, "it would, evidently, be a much more rational plan to put the statutes, at large, into the hands of the illiterate vulgar, telling them to become their own Lawyers, than to put the text itself of the mysterious Bible into their hands, for the purpose of gleaming therefrom their religion and morality." See Hey's Norrisian Lectures. Vol. 1. p. 77. This learned Protestant Lecturer, Rev. Sir, clearly teaches how all fanatics have understood the force of the Protestant terms your "liberty of conscience" and "private judgment." Nor are we so "degraded in the moral faculty" as not to understand their meaning after the practical commentary of more than two hundred years, which all Protestants have given of those seductive terms.

Thirdly. The learned among Christians, who make

the Bible alone their Rule of Faith, cannot agree, as to its meaning, in the most important points; as the endless variations of Protestants on all religious subjects prove. Hence, we may infer, that, a plain well meaning man, following your Rule may spend much time every day of his life, in reading the Scriptures, without acquiring any clear, consistent, or settled plan of religion from them;

Fourthly. The Rule of Faith previously to the existence of the Scriptures of the New Testament, must have been the testimony of the Church or preaching of the Gospel by men sent by God; "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Mark 16. 15. The first preachers were endowed with the gift of miracles. On the authority of those miracles, the nations received their word, and consented to become members of the Christian Church. The nations having received the word preached to them on the authority of miracles, received afterwards the word written for them, upon the same authority. It was not, therefore, the reading of the Scriptures that brought the nations to the faith, but it was their faith founded on miracles, that brought them to receive the Scriptures, as inspired writings. When miracles ceased to accompany the preaching of the divine word, still it was confirmed, by the miracles first wrought. They were wrought in proof of the divine foundation of the Catholic Church, of the divine mission of her Pastors, and in confirmation of Christ's promise, that "the gates of hell shall never prevail against her."—These miracles lend the same support to the preaching of the word in all ages, when done in the same communion, and by virtue of the same mission, that they did, when preached by the Apostles themselves. The spirit of the Apostles, their authority, their faith, their mission, were not to die with them, they were transmitted as a deposit for their successors, and now exist in the Church founded on them, as truly, and work there as effectually, as if the Apostles were still preaching and administering the Sacraments in person,— "Lo I am with you always." We need not add, Rev. Sir, that they who separate from the Church founded by miracles, oppose the testimony of those miracles to themselves, and, by denying her authority and infallibility, undermine the canonicity of the Scriptures, which they have stolen from her. These observations, Rev. Sir, prove to every dispassionate mind, that Christ never intended that the Bible alone, should be the Christian's rule of faith, and, that, in order to lead mankind to a knowledge of the Christian Religion, He has established an authority in his Church, in whatever denomination of Christians that Church is found, to which all are bound to pay due deference and submission. For "he gave some to teach, to exhort, to convince, to rebuke, and to do the work of Evangelists;"—and writing to the Hebrews the Apostle says, obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves, for they watch over your souls, as they that must give an account." Heb. 13. 17. Here Christians are told to be submissive, to their Pastors. But what becomes of this submission, when every man, according to you, is taught by the Holy Ghost, in the written word of God? Truly, Rev. Doctor, if we imagined that the Holy Ghost speaks to all in the written word of God, we could not see how our divine Lord could have encumbered the world with Pastors. So far from thinking that Christian Ministers hold a divine commission, we should look on them as useless lumber.

Can you, Rev. Doctor, adduce Scripture evidence, that the gospels in the New Testament were actually written by the blessed Apostles and Evangelists, whose names are attached to them? Is it possible for you to prove by any other means, than tradition, that the Sabbath of the Jews was changed by the Apostles to the first day of the week? What other proof can you give, except that of tradition, or the custom of infant baptism. Will you, Rev. Sir, insist on your right of conscience to disbelieve these things, because they are destitute of Scripture proof? We believe you will not. If you did, there would be an end to your preaching in the Middle Dutch Church. The Church of England, one of your Protestant Churches, believes and practices many things with reference to the only two Sacraments, which she retains which are not found in Scripture. With regard to baptism, she uses this form of words, "I baptize thee in the name" &c., which is no where commanded or even mentioned in the Bible. Christ indeed commands this sacrament to be administered in the name of three divine persons, but Scripture does not say that he commanded any words to be used as a form: It is from tradition that we learn it. She also admits the validity of baptism administered by schismatics, which can only be proved from tradition. With regard to the Lord's Supper, their form of consecration consists in reciting the history of the Institution; but we do not find in Scripture, that Christ commanded the Ministers of this sacrament to read that history over the bread and the cup. It says, that Christ commanded them to do as he did; but not that he commanded them to make the history of it a form of consecration. These things, Rev. Sir, are borrowed from the Catholic rule,—the Testimony of the Church.

We shall now endeavor to illustrate our ideas, by a few quotations from a Sermon preached by Archdeacon Hook, in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, in 1818. This Sermon is published with the annual report of the Society, for promoting christian knowledge, for 1818. This Protestant dignitary strenuously reprobates the principle, and this is your rule of faith,—"that every man is to be left at liberty to interpret the Bible in his own way, and cule therefrom his religion." And why? Because "the Bible, though an inspired work, does not convey inspiration." Again, "if every man may worship God in his own way, why may he not equally claim to interpret the law of the land in his own way? Conscience may as readily be made the test of obedience in the one case as in the other." In another place he says, "not only are we told in the apostolic writings, in opposition to the prevailing maxims of the present day, that there are things hard to be understood in the Holy Scriptures, but which is still of higher import to christian men, that the things hard to be understood, may be and have already been wrested to their destruction, and that by men prone to change and immersed in ignorance, by the unstable and unlearned."—2 Pet. 3: Saint Paul teaches that faith cometh not by fanciful interpretation, nor by the partial induction of ignorance but by "hearing" and "hearing by the word of God." Rom. x. v. 17. Now, Rev. Sir, could any Catholic Bishop or Priest reason more clearly or more powerfully against the Bible and the Bible only, as a rule of faith?

The Rev. A. C. Callaghan, a minister of the Church of England, has written two pamphlets on this subject; we recommend to your Calvinicity, the following quotation from his second pamphlet. "Take away from the Bible the interpretation of the Church, and every man's passions will be his own interpreters." See the pamphlet entitled "The Bible Society against the Church and State: and the Primitive Christians, and the Bible, against the Bible Society." Second edition, printed for G. Walker, Paternoster Row, London, 1818.

We put the question fairly to you, Rev. Doctor, and we entreat you to view it dispassionately. Must not the generality of mankind necessarily rely on the learning and fidelity of others, in order to

come to the knowledge of Christ's doctrine. We think there is no possible way of avoiding it without a continued miracle of immediate revelation. First, if we look back to the commencement of christianity, we shall find that the New Testament was written, by the Apostles and Evangelists chiefly in Greek, which tongue, though admitted to have been the most generally known of any one tongue then spoken in the East; yet, that every third christian understood that language, is not to be admitted.

Secondly. Neither was the Scripture immediately translated into every tongue, where christianity was preached.

Thirdly. Nor could poor mechanics, labourers, servants and slaves, procure it, when translated, before the invention of the art of printing. In the early days of christianity, and down to a late period, the price of a single copy of either Testament could not be given by any among the poorer classes of society.

Fourthly. There could not have been, until the art of printing was discovered, Bibles sufficient for half the christians, nay, for the greater number of them, even if they had the means of purchasing them.

Fifthly. Even now, when by means of the press, every one has, or may have, a Bible in the vulgar tongue: How is it possible that the vulgar should know of themselves that it is the word of God? That it has been kept free from corruption in things of necessary belief and practice? That it is faithfully translated from the originals? That, considering the indefinite variety of doctrines contained in it, and almost in every page, how they should be able and have leisure to call out of it a summary of belief, since millions of them are necessitated to spend nearly their whole time in severe toil, to procure a wretched livelihood for themselves and families? That they should be able to compare places of Scripture so effectually as rightly to set a seeming contradiction, in points of faith, when we well know that it is with difficulty, they are brought to understand plain and common things?

When we seriously reflect on these things, we think it strange, that our most gracious Redeemer would require of the poor ignorant people to pick out their religion through the exercise of their own scanty intellect from the Holy Scripture, or to depend on their own weak capacities, for detecting the true sense and interpretation of it.

When reason tells us, that the multitude must, of necessity, trust to others for the truth of the translation of Scripture, let an irrefragable reason be given, by you, why they should not as well, and might as safely, give credit to those for the sense of it, who are in providence to be entrusted, for the sincerity of the version, since it is to be presumed that their teachers understand it to be a true translation no farther, than they know the sense of the words translated.

Notwithstanding these plain truths, Rev. Sir, we know how frequently and vehemently Calvinistic Parsons cry out to the people from the pulpit; "believe not us, believe the Scripture, as if the most ignorant of their auditors were thought by them, to be the proper judges of the Scripture meaning." Thus you and your fellow preachers, impose on the people, by telling them that they do not believe by "proxy." But though your words import that your auditors are the proper judges of the sense of Scripture, if we sift the matter thoroughly, we shall discover that you gentlemen preachers, intend otherwise. When you say "believe not us, believe the Scriptures, you either intend the texts you quote for a proof of what you teach, or you do not. If you intend them for a proof of what you teach, your meaning must be this: believe us, not for our own sakes, but for the Scriptures; that is, believe us, because we teach the very same doctrine, which the Scripture teaches; or believe the Scripture, in the same sense, in which we allude it,—for to believe it in any other sense, would not have the effect of a proof. But, if you have no intention to use the Scriptures which you quote, as a proof of what you teach, do you quote them only to humor and gratify the people. This you will not readily admit, consequently, your quotations from Scripture are adduced as proofs, and when you say, "believe not us, believe the Scripture." You do not intend that the truth of your doctrine should stand or fall, according as your auditors may think it to agree or disagree with the places of Holy writ to which they are directed for the truth of what you deliver. Do you not, therefore, throw dust in the eyes of your middle Dutch Church audience, when you tell them, that they are not to believe you, but the Holy Ghost, and are you not ashamed when you have the audacity to assert, that Protestants judge for themselves in matters of religion and that, in this respect, you do not "put their consciences in your pocket?"

We have proved, and we trust to the satisfaction of your christian public, that the multitude cannot make a right use of Scripture. Are we not, therefore, authorized to conclude, that the Scripture, was never intended by our Saviour, as the only rule of faith? Are we not, therefore, authorized to adopt with the Holy Fathers and the greatest lights of Protestantism, the tradition of the Church, which instructs every one from the ruler to the peasant, in all the articles of the christian faith? But, you, most erudite Doctor and preacher in the Middle Dutch Church, are better pleased to take the poor and illiterate to one book, which they cannot use or properly understand, or, rather, to your own interpretation of that book, as we have already shewn, than to the thousand and one folios, and all the other "heap of stuff that has floated down on the miasmatic air of sixteen hundred years!"

You are mistaken, Rev. Sir, by imagining when we tell you that the Scriptures were not given by our Lord to be our only Rule of Faith, but that you are to have recourse to the living and speaking tribunal which he has established, in order to teach you religion, that we, therefore, put you to the study of the Fathers, the scholastic divines, the Councils &c. No such thing, Rev. Sir, we take you to your old Mother, who is the "pillar and ground work of truth" in whom the Lord placed some to be doctors &c. Your great mistake is in supposing the Rule of Faith was made and intended by God to be put in the hands of every man. It would be absurd to suppose it; and, therefore, the old distinction of Ecclesia docens, and Ecclesia discens, that is the Church teaching and the Church taught, is good and necessary to be practically maintained and upheld by Christians. To the former, consisting of Prelates, and Pastors, the Depositum or Rule of Faith is entrusted; and that they may use it to its proper end, Christ promised to be with them forever,—to send them the spirit of truth, in order to teach them all truth, and that we "may not be tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine." That those Prelates and Pastors, who have the Rule of Faith and are its interpreters, can be more easily found than in the words of your happy and gentlemanly allusion, "Paddy's Kettle," will be proved on a future occasion to your disgrace and confusion.

We, Rev. Sir, admit, that every Christian ought to be able to give a reason for the hope that is in him, and that he ought to know why he believes all and every article of his creed; but we are far from allowing the people, to oppose their own judgment to that of the Church of God in matters of Faith. Such a judgment would be one of intolerable and pernicious indiscretion. It must astonish and arouse the compassion of every reflecting mind, to see the ignorant grossly led by your Preachers to believe, that they are able of themselves to understand the Scripture in all things necessary to salvation, when it is for instructing them right in these very things, that our Saviour appointed Spiritual Guides and

Governors over them, and his Holy Church. You and your compeers know, that the wise and gracious God, in the economy of his great family, the world, has provided and placed several men skilled in several things; some in Civil Government, some in Laws, some in the Medicat Art, &c., and all for the good of the community that men may be aided in those things wherein they are presumed not to have skill enough to act for themselves. But you, in opposition to the wise arrangement of Providence indicate a principle, which leads man to dispise those who have been appointed by the Son of God, to watch over his faith and morals, and to become his own instructor, in the learning and management of those things, wherein, if he finally miscarry, he is lost for certainty. If this be not the "consummation of wickedness," we are at a loss to know in what wickedness consists.

These, Rev. Sir, are a few of our reasons for rejecting the Protestant Rule of Faith, as defined by you. Have we not shewn, even on the authority of the most renowned Protestants, that the Scriptures cannot possibly prove their own inspiration? This point, says the learned Hooker, it is impossible for the Scripture itself to teach." See Eccles. pol. L. I. S. 14. Doctor Covel in his defence, Art. 4 p. 31. says, it is not the word of God which does or can assure us, that we do well to think it the word of God." How then do we know it to be the word of God? Doctor Covel in his defence of Hooker's five books, Art. 4. says, "the first outward motion leading men so to esteem of the Scripture is the AUTHORITY OF GOD'S CHURCH." Now we have asked you to prove from the Scriptures alone the fact of their inspiration, not because it revealed our weak side, but because it exposes yours to a total overthrow. The inspiration of the Scriptures, is an article of Protestant faith. This, as Protestants themselves allow, cannot be proved, by the Scriptures. Therefore, the Scriptures alone, are not the Rule of Faith which Christ established.

Your attack on the great Milner, reminds us of the well known fable, the Jack Ass kicking the dead Lion. You know well that he shook Protestantism to her centre and in her strongest hold. You also know, that his antagonist, Sturges, was a profound scholar.—There was something palpable in the writings of Dr. Sturges. No vague assertion—no quibbling;—no aberrations from the established rules of disputation. The difficulties on both sides were fairly stated, and manfully met; for they wrote for the literary world and not for a conclave of old women, and it is to this we are indebted for the "Letters to a Prebendary," a work which attracted the notice of the British Senate, and which will transmit the name of its immortal author to the remotest posterity. You place him by the side of Tom Paine for saying that "Christ gave no orders to his Apostles to write the New Testament!" If the Bible be your only Rule of Faith, you cannot believe that Christ did give any such command to his Apostles. Produce the text if you can, and if you cannot, why believe he did command his Apostles to write the New Testament? Oh, but they were Apostles and they had the gift of miracles, and because they took the trouble of writing to some Churches, they must have been commanded so to do, and, therefore, we believe they were inspired when they wrote. But, most learned Doctor, did not Barnabas, who was full of the Holy Ghost, and of faith, See Acts. c. l. v. 24, and who was also an Apostle, See Acts. c. xl. v. 13, write an epistle, whose authenticity is admitted by Dupin and Doctor Lardner; see "Credibility of the Gospel History," vol. iii. Why is not this epistle a part of your rule of faith? How do you know that he was not inspired? How do you know that he got no command from Christ to write this epistle? Answer these questions by your rule of faith. When you do, you will regret to have troubled the repose of the great Milner. You shrink from the point at issue, by indulging your puritanical rancour against the Popes. This is the ordinary trick of heretics. They endeavor to blind their followers by exposing the vices and frailties of a few men, forgetting that they were men, and only the ministers of a religion established by a crucified God and his Holy Apostles. Do you forget that the Scribes and Pharisees sat in the chair of Moses? Did our Lord tell the people that they were to be despised? Was the College of the Apostles the Synagogue of Satan, because Judas happened to be an Apostle? But this is straying from our subject. It is incumbent on you to prove, that the Scriptures were given to man as his only rule of faith. It is incumbent on you to shew, that the Church of Christ, is not the guardian, and the depository, of the interpreter of the sacred Scriptures. We are not involved in the claims of any particular Church to the glorious prerogative of being Christ's only spouse. This is not the question at issue. Our question is an abstract one,—namely, whether the Scriptures, as interpreted by every individual be the christian's rule of faith, or whether he is to take the sense of the Scriptures from the Church of Christ.

Our respective claims to the distinction of being Christ's Church, must, obviously be reserved for future discussion. We shall meet you on the subject of our divisions, which never involved a point of faith, when we satisfy ourselves on the present point—your Rule of Faith. But we cannot conclude, without expressing our great surprise at the divisions of Protestants with regard to the very essence of religion, seeing that they are taught, as they assert by Christ himself, under the "guidance of the Spirit of God." How came it then, Rev. Doctor, that your most apostolic man, Luther, who was sent by God to give light to the world, defended until death, the true, real, and substantial presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament, and that he gave Zuinglius his sincere curse, for not having followed the light of his lantern? Do not Protestants think the dignity of Bishops founded on God's word? And do not you, after your predecessor Martin Mar—prelate, cry out "that their calling is unlawful; that they are Ministers of Anti-Christ, worse than the friars, and monks, Devils' Bishops, and Devils' incarnate." See sermon of Martin Mar—prelate printed in 1590. Strange that the written word of God, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, could guide those men, sent by God himself into such opposite extremes. When next impelled by your interior spirit, Rev. Sir, to criticise our dissentions, we beg of you to ponder well, the words of our blessed Lord, "Hypocrite, cast out first the beam of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote of thy Brother's eye."

Again you are intreated to prove your rule of Faith, and to answer those queries of "infinite importance," which like the "smooth pebbles selected from the brook," smite the Gollath of the Calvinistic host. Excuse the iteration.

How do you know the Bible to be the word of God? How do you know which books were written by Divine inspiration? Does the Bible contain the whole of the word of God, or does it not?

If you cannot, as a Logician, and Theologian, as a "Gentleman," "Writer," and Preacher in the Middle Dutch Church solve these queries of "infinite importance," we refer you to the assistance of those "virtuous and highly intelligent ladies," who you say, have passed a favourable verdict on your Instrument for the instruction of the sex. "Lorette or the Canadian Nun."

We are your gentlemanly servants.
JOHN POWER.
THOS. C. LEVINS.

March 27th, 1833.



to be supported at the ensuing election
For Alderman—John R. Rhinelander.
Assistant—Dennis McCarthy.
Collector—Nathaniel T. Weekes.
Assessors—Ebenezer Burrill, Felix O'Neil.
Constables—John W. Comerindyke, William M'Donald.

The question on each name being taken separately, was carried unanimously.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted.
Resolved, That we have unshaken confidence in the administration of Andrew Jackson, which in its foreign relations has commanded the respect and admiration of every nation on the face of the globe, which asking nothing that is not clearly right and submitting to nothing that is wrong, has obtained that justice to our fellow citizens, heretofore perseveringly and absolutely denied to former administrations; and which in its domestic policy amid the storm of faction and disaffection which have assailed it, has deserved the support of every citizen who loves his country, and who, while he would make every concession to his brethren, yet holds it a sacred duty to preserve our glorious institutions, and to transmit them unimpaired to his posterity.

Resolved, That we hail the election of our fellow citizen, Martin Van Buren, to the office of Vice-President, as at once a proud triumph of the Republican party, and the most solemn and emphatic rebuke by the people to that foul coalition, which through his rejection as Minister to Great Britain, aimed an omnipotent blow at the feelings of a patriot President, and unsuccessfully sought the humiliation of a rival, hated for his principles and dreaded for the influence of his talents and his virtues.

Resolved, That the principles and policy of the state administration, merit and receive our cordial support as members of the triumphant party, which placed them in power, notwithstanding the efforts of a desperate and unprincipled combination of discordant materials, united by a secret bond, which the people disdained to ratify.

Resolved, That the charges made against our present worthy Alderman, John R. Rhinelander, are unjust, ungenerous and untrue—his claim for services during the awful visitation which desolated our city last summer, as a physician under the appointment of the Medical Council, in the very focus of infections, a Cholera hospital, when the services of Medical men were doubly valuable to their distressed fellow-citizens, and harassing and dangerous to themselves, having been sustained by the highest legal authority; that his generous and devoted conduct in volunteering to visit Canada, to render assistance to his constituents by investigating the character and mode of treatment, of a new and most fearful pestilence, when many of those who now accuse him, sought their safety in inglorious flight, leaving him and us to take care of ourselves, and to protect their property; and his magnanimous offer, now, to submit the justice of his claim, to a jury of his fellow-citizens, and to that highest of all appeals, the ballot box, prove the integrity of his intentions, and are honorable to his spirit and patriotism as a magistrate, and his philanthropy as a man, and with his fearless, unwavering and honest course as a public officer, give him the strongest claims upon our approbation, gratitude and respect.

Resolved, That for the office of Assessor we have pleasure in recommending Ebenezer Burrill, one of the remnants of that band of patriots and heroes whose zeal in the days of trial and danger, and suffering, secured to us, the privileges we now enjoy, the evening of whose glorious days we would gladly cheer with this proof of our gratitude, and that in his colleague we present a citizen of experience and character, and every way qualified to discharge the duties of the office.

Resolved, That the democratic republican, and useful and meritorious public officer, Dennis McCarthy, merits the thanks and support of this meeting.

Resolved, That in presenting the name of Nathaniel T. Weekes as Collector, we bespeak for him a good portion of the Votes of the Sixth Ward, as a citizen who has long resided among us, who has acceptably filled an inferior office to which he was elected by the voice of the people, and whose business, habits, character, standing and principles, are a guarantee that he will fill the highly responsible office to which he is now nominated, considerately, honestly, honourably and faithfully.

Resolved, That in the remaining nominations on the ticket presented, and we have been actuated by respect for the usefulness, activity, and integrity of the candidates named, and by a desire to sustain the strength and the respectability of a Ticket, which as a whole, we conceive it to be powerful in weight of character, pure in principle, honest capable and faithful, and are known to their constituents, a ticket which with such recommendations must and will triumph.

Resolved, that we pledge ourselves to sustain the nominations here made by all honourable, against all factions and coalitions, by whomsoever formed, under whatever pretences, and however supported.

Resolved, That a Committee of nine be appointed for the purpose of procuring a silver pitcher with suitable devices, to be presented to our much esteemed and highly respected Alderman, John R. Rhinelander, as an expression of the estimation in which we regard him as our fellow-citizen, as well as our efficient, independent representative, and as our feeble token for his invaluable professional services, rendered to the sick and destitute during that gloomy period when our city was enshrouded in black by the visitation of Providence of that dreadful disease the cholera.

The following gentlemen were then appointed the Committee to carry the above resolutions into effect.
Assistant Ald. Denis McCarthy, Abraham Lefoy, George D. Strong, James Rodgers, Daniel McGrath, N. T. Weekes, Thomas Stevens, Isaac Phillips, John L. Dillon.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting be published in the Standard, Mercantile Advertiser, Truth Teller, and Irish Democrat.
SAMUEL RATHBONE, Chairman.
Isaac Phillips, { Secretaries.
John L. Dillon, }

debate is surrendered without your admission. It is worthless,—a pretension to cheat the ignorant, and gull your "christian public." In your last epistle it is affirmed you have "established the inspiration of the Bible by its own internal evidence, and by external proofs, such as miracles, tongues, prophecies; and by historical evidence, and tradition also." In the name of Truth, for truth should be on the lips of a preacher in the Middle Dutch Church, where and when has this extraordinary feat been performed? Where are your arguments? Assertion may dupe your "virtuous ladies" to whom you submitted the verdict of your "Instrument for instructing the sex;" assertion, however, is not argument with your polemic antagonists. But, though there be no proof of your rule of faith in the preceding words, there are adm...

TO WILLIAM COBBETT, M. P.

As a friend of liberty I hailed with rapture the announcement of your election as a member of the British Parliament. The mechanic, the labourer, the poor but honest man have now a friend in power, pledged by a long life of useful exertions to promote their interests. Who ought you to thank for the seat you enjoy? Your own incessant, untiring, and patriotic efforts to bring about that measure of reform through the instrumentality of which you have entered the House of Commons. What most delights me is to reflect on the bold stand taken by you to oppose the election of a "Tory speaker," and, now, I think the people must be blind indeed if they do not perceive the folly of trusting even a "Whig Ministry" in that unbounded manner they have heretofore been disposed to do. At the onset the Ministers were patriots, Oh! how they sighed, and wept for the sufferings of the people; how they expatiated on the cruel torments to which they were (are) subject; and how manfully they were to have reclaimed the constitution from the degradation into which it had sunk! But noble lords are beginning to get indolent in serving the people, they have secured (for a while) fat and profitable livings; their hearts are hardened by the luxuries of their station, their eyes, alas! instead of being fixed on the wants of the people are attracted by sordid avarice to the amassment of virtue's bane. They fain would stop the progress of reform, but the people say determinedly, every abuse must be corrected, every law not based on equity must be abolished, every institution must be purged of all corruptions, lordling tyrants must descend from their high places of pomp, power, and pride, the King must conceive himself to be the agent of the people resting on their mercy. When these reforms take place they say, we will be satisfied, but never until then; we will enjoin on our children to follow up the cause persevered in by us, and after we shall have passed away from the contest, and rest in the grave, at each new victory of their achievement our spirits will mingle with them in their rejoicings. The petty despots with which your nation abounds have trembled at the approach of the present crisis. They have fought long, and fought hard to close the avenues leading to redress upon the people, they were not disposed to trust the inevitable event of reform to arguments and facts. But the people did unite in seeking a reform and thus far they have triumphed, they have become informed, learned, I may say, when compared with their former condition, and how? Through the medium of those moral engines which diffuse knowledge, promote virtue, and sustain the great interests of the people—the Press. I look upon your election as an accession of one to the number of Ireland's advocates; you have ever been the expositor of the hidden and underhanded practices of injustice and villainy to which Ireland has long been a victim and, although yourself a dissenter from that ancient faith so generally professed in Ireland, nevertheless with a firmness bespeaking the freeman, you have advocated the right of man to an unbiased choice of his religion, a choice in which if he is wrong, he is amenable but to his God. The moral energies of the people are awoke, the herald of the approaching change has sounded his clarion, and the world looks with anxiety for the issue of the struggle. Will I be deceived in my anticipation of your efforts for the general welfare of the injured people of the realm, so few indeed are the honest portion of the representatives (of the people) that the honest few must philanthropically protect the suffering many. I congratulate the people of Great Britain and Ireland on your election, the Tories quake, their death knell has already sounded, and their depredations will soon end.

RADICAL REFORM.

THE REPEAL OF THE UNION

"When lawyers mask, 'tis time for honest men
To strip the vizor from their purposes."

The state of Ireland, and the repeal of its legislative Union with England, have lately been the subject of much dispute. It is a subject of vital importance to both countries, and imperiously calls for serious consideration. The eleventh hour has arrived, and nothing has been done by the British Ministry, and it promises to come to the same conclusion which most other affairs of like importance have come to when left to so late a period. I much deplore the necessity which we thus see in Ireland for a thorough renovation. However great are the inconveniences of such a measure, nothing less will do; and whether, according to the methods prescribed by law, or by popular violence, the effect must be the same.—"A stitch in time saves nine," says the proverb, but Parliament tailors are not governed by the ordinary rules of art. Ireland needs regeneration, from the soles of her feet to the crown of her head,

unless the head of the Government, is perfectly sane, the body can never be healthy. It is not one Administration, nor one set of men that has brought Ireland to the state in which it now is; it is the mis-government of centuries, and according to the ordinary process of legislation, it would take centuries to repair the injuries which have been done; but the ordinary process will not do for a famishing country in these times; some extraordinary means must be resorted to, which if the Government do not adopt, the people must and will.

Public attention in England has been drawn lately to this subject, oddly enough, by the disputes between the Government of the United States and the State of South Carolina; some have compared the situation of these States to the relative connexions of Ireland and Great Britain, while others have denied the aptness of the comparison. A London paper, which has preserved some small portion of character for consistency, says that "South Carolina has no more right to separate from the federal Government, than Ireland or Yorkshire have from England." Now, that is the question. Few people are so ignorant as not to know that there is no law by which either a component part of a country, or a conquered province, can separate itself from the mother (there is not much parental affection, I am sure) country; or, as the writer in the *Morning Herald* remarks—"Ireland would be inclined to take the benefit of the act?" but are Nature's laws the only ones which are to be disregarded? And after all what is it Ireland asks for? For a local legislature which is denied, although the despotic Viceroy—I will not call him Vice-despot—is acknowledged to be any thing but a fit man to be the head of the Executive Government; while Stanley the Secretary insults, not only Ireland, but England too. In another number of the same paper, the writer speaks of "the utter hopelessness of an appeal to arms on the part of the people" (not so hopeless, either); he looks upon them as a misguided and deceived people, and lays all the present misery of that unhappy country, upon the shoulders of "one party, if not of one man." With respect to the first, who is it that appeal to arms? Is it the Irish people, or the English Government? Have the Irish people, as a body, been guilty of an illegal or unconstitutional act?—unless the resistance to the payment of Tithes can be considered in that light,—no. But what has been the conduct of the Whig Ministers in that affair? Have they not appealed to arms long ago? And do they not now dread the vengeance of an injured people? Or why do they send troops to Ireland? Is it to strike terror into the hearts of men, whose spirits they can never subdue? Are people for ever to be ruled by the sword? Consistency again! But it is of a piece with the special inquisitions. Lord, how these men can talk! The writer above alluded to, considers the Irish as a misguided people, because (I suppose) they have been led to the knowledge of their wrongs, and now demand redress. I wish, then, the world was misguided—it has been misguided, at any rate, long enough. But the best is to come; "one party" the writer alludes to is "the Repealers," and the "one man," O'Connell, and upon his shoulders he lays the charge, of being the cause of all the present misery of Ireland! He must be surely, strangely deficient in history, or he would have known that Ireland was miserable, long before O'Connell was born, and she certainly has not been much better off, any time for this century past, than she is at present. Not to go back to a very remote period, O'Connell could hardly have had much hand in the last Irish rebellion, and then there was something like misery to afford an excuse. The *Herald* has advocated the cause of Liberty for some years past, and it is really a pity to see these petty inconsistencies sully its pages. The ravings of one who writes on all sides of the question are not worth notice. But, really the politics of the *Herald* are almost as incomprehensible as those of the Whig Ministers, though they are very different. It upholds the Poles, bullies the Irish, sneers at the Belgians, (*les braves Belges!*) abuses the Russians, praises the Dutch and looks with horror at the ambitious advances of France! And is now tells us, that it may be expedient, though there is no law for one state to separate itself from another, when the interests of the two are opposite! Here is consistency, with a vengeance!—But, the fact is, the Unionists are absolutely alarmed, for the elections in Ireland have turned out so contrary to their wishes, that they can think of nothing but Repeal of the Union, Rebellion, and Revolution. The members are nothing, but they dread the moral Power; they know that Justice is demanded, they know that the Rights and the Wrongs of Ireland cannot be passed over now with contempt, and they know that nothing evil can long bear the light. One of the Wise men of the West (Sir Harcourt Lees) has taken the trouble to transcribe an account of the "very liberal reforms" which were passed by the last "Papist" (the bigot) Irish Parliament, and he very gravely says, that we may expect to see the same thing over again; and I think myself it is very likely! He does not mention that an English Protestant Parliament, only a few short years before, caused their King to be beheaded, and later than that, we have an instance of the English people taking the law into their own hands. The Irish are criminal, because they have not been successful: a BLOODY REBELLION, when it succeeds becomes a GLORIOUS REVOLUTION!

AN ANGLO-AMERICAN CITIZEN.

VARIETY.

Blasting Rocks under Water by means of the Diving Bell.—Three men are employed in the diving-bell; one holds the jumper or boring iron, which he keeps constantly turning; the other two strike alternately quick smart strokes with hammers. When the hole is bored of the requisite depth, a tin cartridge, filled with gunpowder, about two inches in diameter, and a foot in length, is inserted, and sand placed above it. To the top of the cartridge a pipe is soldered, having a brass screw at the upper end. The

diving bell is then raised up slowly, and additional tin pipes with brass screws are attached, until the pipes are about two feet above the surface of the water. The man who is to fire the charge is placed in a boat close to the tube, to the top of which a piece of cord is attached, which he holds in his left hand. Having in the boat a brazier, with small pieces of iron red hot, he drops one of them down the tube, this immediately ignites the powder, and blows up the rock. A small part of the tube next the cartridge is destroyed; but the greater part, which is held by the cord, is reserved for future service. The workmen in the boat experience no shock, the only effect is a violent ebullition of the water arising from the explosion; but those who stand on the shore and upon any part of the rock connected with those blowing up, feel a very strong concussion. The only difference between the mode of blasting rock at Howth and at Plymouth is, that at the latter place they connect the tin pipes by a cement of white lead. A certain depth of water is necessary for safety, which should be not less than from eight to ten feet.—*Repository of patent Inventions.*

American Turf Register.—We have received the March number of this ably conducted, spirited, and useful work; and we again recommend it to the patronage of our farmers and others engaged in raising blooded horses, and particularly to our sportsmen. To the practical man it affords a useful and inexhaustible source of reference, and to the sportsman and amateur, a most agreeable and instructive companion.

The present number contains a beautifully executed engraving of the Blooded Horse "BYRON," the winner of the Ladies' Cup on the Central Course; and in every respect sustains the previous reputation of the work.

Manchester.—Extraordinary Case.—A Man transported for fourteen years for stealing his own property.—At the Manchester Quarter Sessions, a man named Richard Harris, of respectable appearance, who had formerly kept a public-house in Manchester, was indicted for having stolen at Manchester, on the 24th of Dec. last, one box, the property of Messrs. Pickford, the carriers. The cases excited considerable interest, as it involved a rather singular and novel question—viz., whether the prisoner had or had not been guilty of stealing his own property? According to the evidence adduced, it appeared that on the above-named day the prisoner called at the warehouse of Messrs. Pickford and Co., the well known carriers, and asked if they had a box for him, which he expected would be sent, addressed to him from Birmingham, by their conveyance? The porter of Messrs. Pickford, whom he questioned, told him that it had arrived, and was in the warehouse; but he had better go into the clerk's office, and pay the carriage before the box was given to him. He accordingly went into the office, and asked one of the clerk's what was the charge for carriage? The clerk told him, and he went away without paying any thing; but he said that he would call again about it. In two or three days afterwards he again called at the office, and asked for the box, saying that he had brought the money to pay for the carriage. On searching for the box in the warehouse it was not to be found, and the prisoner appeared to be exceedingly enraged, declaring that he would bring an action-at-law against Messrs. Pickford for the value of the box and its contents. The clerks and warehousemen had a conversation on the subject, and after considering the circumstances of the prisoner's previous visit to the warehouse, together with the fact of the box not being seen since that visit, they began to suspect that the prisoner himself must have taken it away. Messrs. Pickford in consequence applied to the Magistrates, and obtained a warrant to search the prisoner's premises, which they did, and there found the identical box, emptied of its contents. Evidence to the above effect having been adduced, the Jury stopped the Chairman as he was about to sum up, observing that they were quite satisfied with the facts of the case, but they wished to know from him whether it was a felony for a man to steal his own goods?—The Jury returned a verdict of guilty.—The Chairman in passing sentence said that the prisoner was a man of very considerable and astute intellect, and had managed this robbery with a deal of tact. He was liable to be transported for life, but the Court would not go that length. Still, however, considering the address he had displayed, they could do no less than transport him for fourteen years.—The prisoner, on hearing his sentence, burst into tears, and was taken down crying bitterly.

Something Novel.—On yesterday, the anniversary of Washington's birth-day, at an early hour an unusual concourse of persons were assembled in the vicinity of the Exchange Hotel to witness a parade of the "Carroll Corps" which had been announced in the "Alleghany Democrat." For some time the multitude stood in suspense, apparently willing to gaze upon the manes of the illustrious and patriotic Carroll of Carrollton; but the days of miracles having gone by, the blunders of Mr. Johns became manifest by the soldierlike appearance of Corps of "Carroll Blues" under the command of Capt. M'Kown.—*Pittsburg Manufacturer.*

Roasting by Gas.—An apparatus for roasting meat of every kind by gas has been recently invented by Mr. Hicks, the patentee of the improved iron oven, by which spirit is obtained from the exhalations of fermented bread.—*London Encyclopedia of Cottage Architecture, IX.*

The Puritans carried their peculiar tenets into the minutest affairs of life. When Lord Brooke, one of their number, played at bowls, he would run after his cast, and cry "Rub, rub, rub," in the eager but absurd hope that such a cry would give effect to his play. On such occasions his chaplain would run after him with equal eagerness, and earnestly exclaim, "Oh, good, my Lord, you must leave that to God."

A Rainy day in Germany.—An English rainy day is bad enough; but the German rain is like every thing else German; it bores through its business incomparably. It comes down with a quiet grim resolution, a plodding pertinacity, a *vis inertia* of wet, that would irrigate the deserts of Arabia. The visible horizon is contracted to the ground of the umbrella; the sky is merely a grave gloomy roof a little higher than the chimneys; day is visible only by the help of candle-light; the air is nearly as thick as the earth, and both air and earth are but diversities of quagmire.

A Prescription for Cholera.—One of the French Physicians recommends equal parts of tea!—sugar!!—vinegar!!!—and gin!!! If this wont kill nothing will.

THE
TRUTH TELLER
IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING.
At the Printing Office,
BOWEN'S BUILDING,
No. 333 Broadway.

TERMS—Four dollars per annum, payable yearly in advance—any communications to the Editor or Agents must be post paid.